

ANARY VASYLCHENKO

THE HISTORY OF UNITED EUROPE WHICH IS NOT COMMITTED TO REMEMBER

th

- I

+ em, - No. a. 7 A t

e 1 E. "Ogi + YuY -.

Appotapop

There are stories in history that are diligently avoided not only by Western politicians, but also by European historians. The "conspiracy of silence" has shrouded the true history of European integration in general and the emergence of the European Union in particular. All current ideas about the mechanisms and models of the formation of the EU are nothing more than a propaganda fiction imposed on us from Brussels.

Having resorted to the analysis of documents that are secret and inaccessible to the domestic reader, the historian Andrey Vasilchenko proves with facts in his hands that the idea of forming the European Union arose in the bowels of the Third Reich. Moreover, the development of a "united Europe" was carried out in the think tank of the most sinister organization in the history of mankind - in the headquarters of the SS. Decades after the collapse of the Third Reich, terrible plans were again brought to light and began to be gradually implemented. It is for this reason that the EU structures are so indifferently watching the rehabilitation of Nazism in the Baltic States and Ukraine.

This book allows us to answer the burning question: can an association created exactly according to Hitler's recipes be our ally? The reader will have to find out when and why the creation of the European Union was actually planned.

e Andrey Vasilchenko

Foreword

Chapter 1. The European Union - the brainchild of the SS?

Chapter 2. "United Europe" in the reflections of Stalingrad

Chapter 3. Was there an anti-fascist? (To the history of one document)

Chapter 4. The European Economic Community - Legacy

Hitler's regime

o Chapter 5. "The Fourth European Integration": the path of aggression and enslavement

o Chapter 6. "Respectable Europeans", or Who Really Invented NATO?

o Chapter 7. "European Community" - a pretext for revenge

o Chapter 8

OOOO about

OOOO about

Chapter 9. "European Union" as a slogan of collaborators Chapter 10. Eurofascism for the European Union

Chapter 11

Chapter 12. Ideological Throwing in a Closed Field Chapter 13. Prototype of Pan-Europe: from Napoleon's Empire to Hitler's Reich

Chapter 14

Chapter 15

Chapter 16

Applications

List of used literature

and

IW N 1

Andrey Vasilchenko "European Union" Hitler

© Vasilchenko A., 2015 © TD Algorithm LLC, 2015

In October 2014, in the Parisian suburb of La Celle-Saint-Cloud, a group of young people hid outside a supermarket. When Marine Le Pen appeared on the street, heading the National Front of France, stones flew at her. According to eyewitnesses, the assassins managed to hit the "target" several times. The attackers waited until Le Pen got into his car and started throwing stones at the car. The representative of the "right" was not injured, but the car has some damage, police said. "Three or four young people interviewed local residents to make sure that it was really her," an anonymous source in the law enforcement department told one of the French publications. Actually, this trick could be considered simple hooliganism, if not for its obvious political overtones. Marine Le Pen is currently one of the most popular French politicians, and she is preparing to face off in the fight for the presidency. In his tenure, a similar attempt was made by her father, the founder of the National Front, a veteran of the landing troops, Jean Marie Le Pen. In the fight for the highest post of the country, he had to converge with both the conservative Jacques Chirac and the socialist Francois Mitterrand. Usually this confrontation was portrayed very conditionally: on the one hand, the "fascist" Jean Le Pen, on the other, the "beacon of democracy", a supporter of European integration Francois Mitterrand. The paradox of the situation was that in reality everything was exactly the opposite. Jean Marie Le Pen became an orphan during World War II. As a teenager, he joined the partisan movement and fought with weapons in his hands against the German invaders. After the end of the world massacre, he signed up for the landing troops and went to defend the interests of his country in Indochina. François Mitterrand, on the contrary, in his early youth was a member of many fascist organizations, in particular, he was an activist of the French Volunteers, maintained ties with the ultra-radical Cagoulares. During the years of occupation, he was among the collaborators, in other words, accomplices of the German occupiers. He admired the head of the Vichy regime, Marshal Pétain, and even earned the Francis Gallic order from the puppet government, which was the highest award in occupied France. However, before the court of François

Mitterrand did not appear. The documents incriminating him disappeared in an unknown direction, and he himself convincingly voiced the version of his assistance to the Resistance, which, however, for some reason no one could confirm. In all this confusion of characteristics and concepts, when it is difficult to determine who is actually a "fascist" and who is an "anti-fascist", the political watershed line runs along the degree of approval of European integration processes.

Back in 1991, Jean-Marie Le Pen stated in his interview to the Russian newspaper *The Day*: "I am opposed to a federal Europe, a Europe that would require European states to renounce what is the basis of state sovereignty — the national currency, the national army, national diplomacy, etc. I am against transferring these powers to some kind of supranational authority, to some special authorities. Moreover, it is already quite obvious today that such a supranational power will be beyond the reach of the national and state control of individual European peoples. We can already be convinced by the example of NATO that the future European government will be only an organ of the mondialist bureaucracy and nothing more.

Now a similar position is held by his daughter Marine Le Pen, who followed in her father's footsteps and headed the National Front. She is not just, but more than an opponent of European integration, as she believes that the collapse of the European Union will lead to the prosperity of Europe. In an interview, she said: "The European Union, like the Soviet Union, is beyond repair. I want to return Europe to a union of sovereign states." It should be noted that the opinion of Marine Le Pen is shared by many economists and politicians. The President of the European Council Herman van Rompuy has previously expressed concern about the strengthening of the positions of populist politicians, including right-wing ones, in the EU countries. However, in fact, it is not specific political or ideological programs that are gaining real popularity, but a negative attitude towards the European Union as a centralized system. "What is the European Union? This is the USSR on a European scale! And just like the USSR, the EU project suffered a political and economic collapse!" Marine Le Pen said in another interview. In an interview with a *Komsomolskaya Pravda* journalist, she explained: "In reality, the EU was conceived as a counterbalance to the United States and a new political player in the geopolitical field. But the American "melting pot" model of integration cannot be applied in

Europe. Economically, the EU has also suffered a catastrophe. We have the weakest economic growth in the last ten years! The euro, conceived as an instrument to finance European political integrity, has not materialized as a single currency suitable for all. There is an expression: a suit is too small for some and too big for others. The only country to which the "suit" of the euro fit, *tutelka to tutelka*, is Germany. She plays on the currency field and wins all the time. What led to the creation of the European Union? Moreover, sovereignty was taken away from the European nations and gradually handed over to technocrats, whom no one elected and who answer to no one! We have a pseudo-democracy, in which you can talk, even shout, but no one will

hears."

Although, as recent political events show, it turns out that in Europe it is impossible to say everything that you think. Moreover, the EU is going to pass a law prescribing to citizens what and how they should not only speak, but also think. Neither Dr. Goebbels nor J. Orwell, who wrote the legendary dystopia 1984, dreamed of such a thing. In the near future, not only departments to oversee the tolerance of citizens, but also special correctional camps for "intolerant" youth may appear in Europe. The introduction of total control over public sentiment will be accompanied by the most severe ban on any criticism of homosexuality and feminism. All this might seem like a "horror story" if it were not true: these are the provisions contained in the working documents of the European Parliament. The adoption of the "European national law on the promotion of the ideals of tolerance" threatens to establish total ideological and ideological control over the whole of Europe. And if Marine Le Pen compares the European Union with the Soviet Union, then other Euroskeptics are increasingly talking about the similarities of today's Europe with the Third Reich.

Such a comparison may seem like an exaggeration or a kind of metaphor. However, when critical journalists refer to the European Union as the "Fourth Reich", they are not far from the truth. In November 1944, a secret American intelligence report reported a secret meeting held at the *Maison Rouge* in Strasbourg. Representatives of the German industrial elite took part in it. On the agenda

was the development of a plan for the post-war reconstruction of Germany in order to return the Nazis to power and create a mighty empire -

"Fourth Reich". The document, sent to the leadership of the United States and Great Britain, outlined how the industrialists were going to recreate Germany with money transferred in advance to the banks of Switzerland and other countries. Among the participants in the meeting in Strasbourg were representatives of industrial groups, concerns and officials of the Ministry of Armaments. They agreed that the "Fourth Reich" should not become a military, but an economic empire, and that it should include not only Germany, but also other European countries. However, the meeting of industrialists was by no means the first and plans for the "rebirth" of Germany did not arise from scratch.

When on December 16, 1943, in the Grand Hotel Esplanade, which was once located on the Potsdamer Platz in Berlin, a meeting of the participants of the "European circle" took place, the head of the planning department of the Imperial Ministry of Armaments, Hans Kerl, in his speech gave a kind of report on the results of the activities of the secret organization, to which he belonged. He recalled that "the European idea was born in the summer of 1940", but at the same time expressed regret that cooperation within the framework of the "European Economic Community" still leaves much to be desired. Statements of this kind can confuse many of our readers who are accustomed to established versions and interpretations of modern history. In fact, the use of "pan-European" rhetoric can be found in many German documents from the era of the National Socialist dictatorship. European historians after 1945 fearfully avoided the plans of the Third Reich to "transform" Europe and

"rallying the continent".

However, some of the researchers still paid attention to this problem. Almost immediately after the end of World War II, a highly remarkable work saw the light of day: Ludwig Dechio's book *Equilibrium or Hegemony*. The study of the main problems of modern state history. In this work, the author interpreted the National Socialist policy as an attempt to establish hegemony through the "rallying" of Europe. And it was by no means the first attempt in the history of mankind. It was noted that Hitler's "European policy" already had predecessors, including in other countries, who tried to "rally" Europe. However, in all these cases, attempts at forced integration ended in complete failure, incalculable loss of life and the decline of individual countries. According to Ludwig Dechio, Hitler's policy was the most radical and the most

destructive attempt to establish continental hegemony. The result was the virtually complete destruction of the European system (recall, the work was published in 1948) and interference in the politics of non-European powers. In 1951, Hadjo Holborn's book *The Political Collapse of Europe* was published in New York. In it, the American author described the process of the collapse of the foundations of "old Europe", which inevitably became the object of manipulation and selfish aspirations. In any case, both Holborn and Dehio viewed the events of 1945 as "the end of Europe", implying that Europe had to leave the historical stage along with the Nazi dictatorship.

A slightly different point of view was held by the author of the *New History of Europe*, Otto Westphal. His book was published in 1955 in Stuttgart. The author tried to build a pattern of world history from the point of view of "ex-fascism". He believed that the original European foundations were crushed as a result of the geopolitical rise of two powers: America (USA) and Russia (USSR). At the same time, both of these geopolitical poles were a complete opposite. America was a symbol of dynamism and mobility, while Russia was a symbol of protective tendencies. As a result, having become a hostage to such contradictory positions, Europe allegedly decided to rally under the leadership of Hitler. It cannot be denied that there was a lot of subjectivity and ambiguity in this approach. However, at about the same time, an article by Paul Klücke was published in the *Contemporary History Quarterly* entitled "The National Socialist Ideology of Europe." Its author for the first time expressed the opinion that Hitler, although not from the very beginning, nevertheless tried to carry out European integration, which was to be used purely in German

interests. Since it was in the mid-1950s that active progress in political integration began, which later began to be regarded as the initial stage in the formation of the current European Union, it was decided to ignore this approach. It seemed unnecessarily provocative - no one wanted to remember the political realities of the recent past. European society chose to put on rose-colored glasses and pretend that European integration was purely a post-war "invention."

For some time, the tendency prevailed not so much to analyze the processes associated with the attempts of the Nazis to implement European integration, but to publish documents on this issue. Gerhardt Hass and Wolfgang Schumann, the authors of a collection of documents published in East Berlin in 1972, can be called pioneers in this topic.

Anatomy of Aggression. New Documents Concerning the Military Aims of Fascist German Imperialism during the Second World War. The compilers of the collection of documents wanted to prove that the Third Reich intended to carry out the "transformation" of Europe based on the interests of finance capital. In total, the book included 49 documents, which were mostly stored in the State Archives of Potsdam, only a few of them were borrowed from the Federal Archives in Koblenz (now the Federal Archives in Berlin - Lichterfeld). The documents covered the period from 1940 to 1944. In the traditional Marxist style of historiography, the compilers of the collection focused on the economic components of the problem, bringing to the fore the Imperial Ministry of Economics, the Imperial Industrial Group, and concerns like IG Farben. Only in documents relating to the years 1943-1944 could traces of the processes that took place in the bowels of the Imperial Foreign Office be found. Anatomy of Aggression offered readers a picture of a two-stage "discussion of plans for the transformation of Europe." In general, this coincided with the conditional periodization of the war, in which two major periods were distinguished: 1940-1941 and events that occurred after 1943. This approach seems reasonable. After the military defeat of France, the Third Reich exercised control over significant territories of Western and Central Europe, which inevitably led to the question: how were these spaces to be used further? According to the compilers of the collection, the economic component prevailed in these discussions. In support of this, documents were cited regarding a possible customs and monetary union with Norway and the Benelux countries. At the same time, the readiness of the Imperial Industrial Group to carry out the capital integration of the industrial enterprises of Holland was indicated. Evidence was given that the intention to carry out such economic integration was with the Imperial Ministry of Economics, headed by Hermann Goering. The next ten documents, relating to 1941-1942, demonstrated that the Imperial Industrial Group was interested in continuous economic expansion, in particular into the space of South-Eastern Europe.

After the defeats of 1943, the plans of the Third Reich for military superiority on the continent had to be adjusted. From this moment on, the intentions to mobilize European

countries to fulfill the German war plans. On the example of numerous documents of the Imperial Foreign Office, Hass and Schumann show that it was during this period of time that the so-called. "European Committee", which begins the development of a project to create a "European Union of States". A slogan is raised on the flag saying that Europe must unite if it does not want to completely lose its geopolitical significance. Under German leadership, it was supposed to overcome the imaginary communist threat, prevent intra-European wars of the future, and also provide no less mythical "welfare" and "social justice". One of these documents stated: "In the desperate struggle for the future of Europe, we are the foremost fighters of a new and better order in which all European peoples will find their rightful place."

On the one hand, the Anatomy of Aggression contains highly remarkable documents that testify to the interest of the German economy in the "transformation" of the European

space, but, on the other hand, it should be noted that this collection clearly underestimated the ideological component of the European integration processes planned by the Nazis. The policy of the Third Reich was not at all determined by the intentions of "financial capital", rather, on the contrary, the industrialists were forced to serve the policy of the NSDAP. Nevertheless, a number of ideas from this collection can be called extremely interesting. For the first time, parallels were drawn between the "transformation" of Europe during the Second World War and the formulations and concepts used by modern politicians engaged in the processes of European integration. In both cases, one could detect a pronounced anti-Russian component. And the second point: the unification of Europe, both under the authority of the Third Reich, which was guided, according to the compilers of the collection, by the principles of economic expansion, and in the post-war period was a continuous process. That is, the current European Union, willingly or not, was the successor to the "European Union of States" planned by the National Socialists.

The second fundamental collection of documents can be called the volume "Europe and the Third Reich" compiled by Hans Werner Neulen, which was published in Munich in 1987. The appearance of this collection was not least "provoked" by the publication of *Anatomy of Aggression*. In contrast to historians from the GDR, Neulen wanted

to show that "in the shadow of the swastika, many European projects were calculated" and that Hitler was a principled opponent of "European politics". In addition, the author-compiler wanted to form a clear base that would make it possible to evaluate all the projects of European integration that were developed in the depths of the departments of the Third Reich. In this case, he proceeded from the fact that "a lost struggle for a truly European concept meant a political defeat in the war." The collection contains documents from many countries, but if we talk about German projects proper, they were reflected in 27 documents that were borrowed from the Political Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Federal Archives of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Cabinet of Documents of European History, Modernity and Future Planning, as well as from private collections. Neulen chose not to focus only on the names of the Nazi "magnitudes" - Hitler, Goebbels and Ribbentrop, for this reason there are documents whose authors at that time were not at all known to the public.

Materials from the collection "Europe and the Third Reich" give an idea that plans for a "European Union" were developed almost to the level of detail, although the timing of their implementation remained uncertain. The catalyst for the development of the "European concept" was the events that would later be called "a fundamental turning point in the course of the war." After 1943, the point of view was clearly voiced that "too much German blood was shed", and therefore the whole of Europe had to fight against the USSR ("prospective mobilization of the forces of Europe in the name of our victory"). Of course, different departments held different views on the extent to which the political integration of Europe should be carried out, just as it remained unclear how independent the territories occupied by Germany and its allies could be within the framework of the "New Europe". For example, in the Imperial Foreign Office, projects were developed that suggested that the "organic reorganization of Europe" should be based on the "independence of the European nations." Also in the collection, for the first time, the plans of the SS to create a kind of "European confederation" were announced. It should be noted that in Neulen's book there is a clear absence of documents on the economic and economic issues of the European integration conceived by the Nazis. By and large, Neulen did not pay worthy attention to the period of 1940-1941, which, in his opinion, passed "in the intoxication of the victory over France." However, it should be noted that the author actually for the first time

introduced the reader to the fundamental developments that were undertaken by Werner Deitz and Karl Clodius. Taking into account that in the collection published in the GDR there was a clear bias towards the economy, *Anatomy of Aggression* and *Europe and the Third Reich* organically complement each other to some extent.

The collection of historical sources prepared by Neulen was supposed to tell about projects for the "reorganization" of Europe, which often contradicted each other. However, it should be noted that the selection of documents was made in such a way as to rehabilitate the idea of European integration as much as possible, to rid it of the "Nazi past". Another collection of documents, by its very name, drew parallels between the plans of the Third Reich and the European Union brought to life. In this case, we are talking about the first volume of Documents on the History of European Integration, published in 1985 in English. While the entire series was edited by Walter Lipgens, the compiler of the first volume was Michael Zalewski. Considering the title of the series as a whole, the title of the first volume ("Continental Plans for the European Union, 1939-1945") left no doubt: European integration was a continuous process and it began during the Nazi dictatorship. In total, Zalevsky published 43 documents translated into English in his collection. However, the translation was duplicated by an illustration of a microfilmed document in the original, and therefore the specified volume can be formally considered bilingual.

The selection of historical sources carried out by Michael Zalewski can be called the most representative and comprehensive. At some points, the compiler even went against his own convictions. In particular, he cites documents related to SS projects. There were too many propaganda clichés in them, and therefore it was very important to show the most important thing in these documents, namely the intention to carry out uniform colonial expansion. First of all, this applied to the so-called "Eastern Territories". As a result, the "New European Order" assumed the mass migration of European ethnic groups. As a result, the Nazi policy of genocide linked both racial-political and purely economic moments. Michael Zalewski is trying to draw a line between "non-European" ideas, which nevertheless used "European vocabulary", and the projects of the Second World War, which in

eventually resulted in the creation

the current European Union. Following the principles of Western political correctness, Zalevsky hypocritically states that the true "European community" is built solely on the principles of mutual respect and democracy, and National Socialism has perverted European traditions. Such statements can be considered nothing more than a hypocritical nod to the liberal political ideas that prevail in Western Europe.

Since the mid-90s, German professor Gerd Simon has been publishing documents on the plans of the Third Reich regarding the "transformation" of Europe. He spent most of his scientific life within the walls of the University of Tübingen, where he was engaged in interdisciplinary research. Formally, the scope of his scientific interests was to be limited to intersectoral semasiology, however, expanding the scope of his interests, Professor Simon began to study the problem of the political use of German studies, which eventually led him to publish documents previously unknown to the scientific community that told about the development of the "European Union" project in years of National Socialist dictatorship.

There is also a complete opposite in the study of this problem. An example is the book The Nazi Roots of the Brussels European Union, which became widely known in Western Europe. This book is far from academic standards, and if not for its length (almost 300 pages), it could be mistaken for a large advertising booklet. Such an impression might be strengthened if you read the subtitle of this book: "Everything you always wanted to know about the 'Brussels EU' but no one dared to tell you!" However, behind all the grotesque phrases, in many respects the kitsch layout and design of the publication lies a very serious problem. The book was written by a whole team of authors who were inspired to act by the example of August Kowalczyk, a survivor of the "death camp" Auschwitz. In an uncomplicated form, through flashy inscriptions (which, as it were, hints at the mass stupefaction of Europeans who have ceased to perceive thought if it is not enclosed in a catchy, "advertising" look), it tells about a possible continuity between the Third Reich and the modern European Union. The introduction to the edition states: "In this book

talks about things that many readers may, for obvious reasons, reject at first. They may claim that if such serious historical information documented here

was true, they would no doubt have heard of it sooner. With this in mind, we, the authors, considered it our duty to encourage our readers not only to read this book, but also to refer to the documentary sources indicated in the footnotes on its pages. The conceptual basis of the book is a hybrid of two conspiracy theories: "a worldwide conspiracy of bankers" and "a new world order". In this case, we are talking about political manipulations undertaken by chemical and pharmacological concerns, which, in fact, determined the policy of the Third Reich first, and now the policy of the European Union. Since the goals of these concerns have not changed, we can talk not just about the structural similarity between the policies of the Nazis and the policies of the EU, but about their direct continuity. It should be noted that this model in many respects (although by no means in everything) was close to Marxist historiography. In particular, the annotation to "Nazi Roots ..." stated: "From this book you will also learn that the First World War, another major tragedy of the twentieth century, was, in essence, the first attempt to conquer the world for the interests of this corporation. Moreover, having failed to conquer Europe and the world militarily, the oil and pharmaceutical cartel has invested in a third attempt - the economic and political conquest of Europe through the "Brussels EU". It is therefore not surprising that the main architects of the Brussels EU were hired from among the technocrats who were already developing plans for a post-war Europe conquered by the Nazi-Cartel coalition. At present, any conspiracy theories are perceived by the public as "fun science of the postmodern era." However, this book contains documents that are of interest for a general study of the problem. Again, the very fact of the appearance of this book suggests that the relationship between the Third Reich and the European Union is no longer a "secret with seven seals."

What would Europe look like if the Third Reich had won World War II? This question can be answered very, very roughly. In fact, Nazi Germany was not a cohesive state. Torn apart by numerous internal conflicts, the top of the Reich does not allow us to talk about classical totalitarianism, but rather about "feudal anarchy" or polycracy. Under the conditions of the existence of such regimes, it is very difficult to predict events, all the more so to talk about the prevalence of any concepts in the future. Therefore, it is difficult to say which of the European integration projects would be implemented. Although some of the publicists

argue that perhaps the "New Europe" and the current European Union would not be very different from each other. And this point of view finds more and more supporters. This is evidenced by the popularity of the pamphlet novel "He's Here Again", which was written by Timur Vermesh. According to the plot, Hitler found himself in the modern European Union and is very pleased that many of his ideas were brought to life. In any case, it can be argued that neither the National Socialist "New Europe" nor the current European Union is Europe proper. In both cases, we see a fundamental rejection of precisely European traditions, the subordination of national interests to an abstract but dominant idea, the prevalence of anti-Russian and openly Russophobic tendencies in foreign policy. Western liberalism and Nazi-type National Socialism have in common not only this, but also the commitment to rationalism, the desire to plan not only processes, but any space and even human life. If only for this reason, we need to know how real European integration began and with whose product we now have to deal.

On the edge of the Teutoburg Forest, shrouded in dozens of legends and legends, a tiny settlement of Vlotho arose in the KhSU century. Now 19 thousand people live in this German town, and in the early 50s of the twentieth century it had only 8 thousand inhabitants. If not for the stone houses, then in those days Vlotho could be mistaken for a large village. The people who lived in the town knew each other

by name. The appearance of a new person has never been left without attention, especially if the new citizen was a school teacher. Alexander Bomhoff, who appeared in Vlotho in 1953, from the very beginning seemed strange to the local inhabitants. Instead of going to work in school, he opened his own institution, which he called the "Pan European Educational Project". In the course of the project, he talked endlessly about a united Europe, about the abolition of borders, about a single European economic space, about a common European currency. The townspeople were no less embarrassed by the fact that Alexander Bomhoff looked like a forty-year-old man, although, according to the documents, he should have been an elderly man who was born in the 19th century.

If the townspeople could learn some details from Bomhoff's recent biography, they would be even more surprised! On February 2, 1951, the secret services organized Bomhoff's flight from the GDR to West Berlin. One could only wonder why the chief of West German intelligence, Gehlen, needed some kind of school teacher? In those days, Gehlen, who received active support from the CIA and was actually on the financial support of the American intelligence services, was creating an intelligence network in East Germany. He threw his agents into the territory of the GDR, but by no means rescued ordinary school teachers from there. However, as expected, the school teacher Alexander Bomhoff was not so simple. In the GDR, he led a double life. On the one hand, he was an exemplary citizen, an activist of the For a New School union, a member of the trade union movement, and was even elected a delegate to the Third People's Congress. On the other hand, he had crossed the border more than once on forged documents issued in the name of a certain Dornik. In Hamburg, Bomhoff-Dornik met with representatives of an underground organization known as the Dahlke Group. It consisted of former SS officers who

prepared for armed operations on the territory of the GDR. However, Bomhoff's secret activities could not go unnoticed. These sub-policemen came to the attention of the American intelligence services as early as 1948 - it was decided to use them for their own purposes. However, on March 28, 1950, Bomhoff was temporarily arrested by Soviet employees of the Ministry of State Security. He was released in December. It was after this that it was decided to organize Bomhoff's escape to West Berlin.

But even Bomhoff's underground activities could not explain why he looked 20 years younger than he was supposed to according to the documents. Years would pass before it became known that under the name of Alexander Bomhoff the SS officer Alexander Dolezalek was hiding (ticket number 216 983). There are two interesting facts about Dolezalek's biography: firstly, he joined the SS even before Hitler came to power, which means that the young man was a staunch National Socialist. Secondly, the Dolezalek family was always interested in pan-European theories, which were expressed in the 1920s by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, who considered Pan Europe as a counterbalance to Soviet Russia. These facts make it possible to understand why the "school teacher" preached the ideas of "United Europe" so zealously. It was Dolezalek who at one time gave birth and developed the idea of integrating the European space on the basis of the SS. In 1943, as head of group p of the SS Main Directorate, he began to develop plans for the transformation of Europe. However, these developments almost every month had to be amended, dictated by the situation on the fronts. As a result, Dolezalek proposed a detailed program, which included the so-called "Five Theses". Of particular interest is the "Third Thesis", which directly concerned the forthcoming reorganization of Europe. In it, Dolezalek spoke about overcoming European egoism, about the formation of a single European space, about the complementarity of European peoples, about eliminating borders between European countries. After the idea of introducing a single European passport was put forward, it was safe to say that Dolezalek was hatching plans to create a "European confederation". He emphasized that the new supranational formation was to be built allegedly on the "free will of the peoples." Such projects should have been an obvious signal to the Western powers that the SS leadership was ready to abandon purely imperialist plans in exchange for involvement in the preparation of a war against the USSR.

The "European confederation" was supposed to emerge after the signing of the "European Charter" developed by the same Dolezalek. Some of its points at first glance may seem very democratic. For example, Dolezalek talked about the imaginary freedoms that were planned to be granted to European peoples and national cultures. This part of the document seems to be extremely important, and therefore we allow ourselves to quote it.

fully.

Six basic freedoms:

1. Freedom of peoples from violence from world powers.
2. Freedom of peoples in the choice of forms of national self-organization.
3. Freedom of peoples from foreign oppression and assimilation.
4. Freedom of the individual from coercion to self-determination.
5. Freedom of national cultures from any coercion and from globalization.
6. Freedom of faith from godlessness and political abuses.

Seven basic rights:

1. The human right to work and the opportunity to work.
2. The right of a person to the free development of his capabilities and to choose any profession in accordance with talents and diligence.
3. The right of a person to a standard of living that is due to his abilities and diligence.
4. Human right to make decisions in the processes of society formation.
5. Human right to property and land.
6. The human right to leisure, to rest and to participate in all manifestations of cultural life.
7. Human right to support in case of unforeseen need.

However, by the beginning of 1945 it became clear that it was necessary to make new and very significant adjustments to the plans for the transformation of Europe. Without any doubt that Germany was doomed to defeat, Alexander Dolezalek in April 1945 began to develop a program for the "European Liberation Movement", which was supposed to operate exclusively by legal means. It was assumed that the movement would contribute to the folding of the so-called "European peace order", that is, the continental system erected on the basis of the "European Confederation". In this

The program draws attention to several points: "5. Elimination of centuries-old contradictions between fraternal European peoples through cooperation within the framework of the European Confederation. 6. Within the European Confederation, all European peoples will have a free right to existence, a national way of life and political self-organization ... 8. The presence of a European court in which conflicts between European peoples will be settled, which will avoid violence ... 11. Elimination of ethnic borders in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe... 12. Fruitful cooperation within the framework of the common European economy". In essence, Dolezalek announced the concept of creating the European Union in the spring of 1945, anticipating many of the ideas that were put into practice decades later.

It seems very interesting to assume that if at first Dolezalek was inspired by the pan-European ideas of Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, then after the end of the war the Count studied the developments of the SS officer with interest. In any case, during a visit to Zurich in

In September 1946, Winston Churchill delivered a speech in which he announced the need for a "United States of Europe". The text of this speech was prepared by the Count, who, after reading Dolezalek's papers, suddenly revised some of his ideas. The interest of Western intelligence services in the projects of Alexander Doletzalek was easily explained. Firstly, it was planned to oppose the USSR with a kind of "United Europe", and not a disparate conglomerate of European states. Secondly, the endless delegations that came from different countries to participate in the "Pan European Training Project" were the perfect cover for recruiting activities. By and large, Doletzalek did not even have to make significant adjustments to his designs. He easily changed one patron for another. First, he built his programs in the depths of the SS, then - under the patronage of Gehlen, from behind whom the CIA "ears" were constantly peeking out.

Perhaps, in the early 1950s, the project of a united Europe, stretching from England to Poland, looked wild. But Dolezalek's propaganda influenced the minds of those who would later sign the Schengen Agreements and the Maastricht Treaties. The plans developed the day before yesterday in the bowels of the SS are today the political realities of a united Europe. It is highly significant that Dolezalek was forgiven for his SS past without any problems. He didn't even go through the standard procedure

denazification, obligatory even for petty party officials. But Dolezalek was not just a "European dreamer" from the planning department of the SS (as some researchers try to portray him). He was involved in the development of the Ost plan, in the preparation of mass deportations and in the planned ethnic reshaping of the continent. But in this case, European politicians once again demonstrated exceptional selectivity. Doletzalek's SS past was simply forgotten. Therefore, one should hardly be surprised that the modern European Union turns a blind eye to the marches of SS veterans in the Baltic states and Western Ukraine. Why be surprised? After all, they come from the same SS cradle.

Chapter 2. "United Europe" in

reflections of Stalingrad

On February 2, 1943, the Battle of Stalingrad ended, which is rightfully considered one of the bloodiest battles in the history of mankind. It not only marked the beginning of a turning point in the course of the war, but left no trace of the Third Reich's inherent blind faith in the "invincibility of German weapons." It is not surprising that it was from February 1943 that some of the Nazi bosses began to admit that the war might not end for them at all with a "victorious finale". If only for this reason, they began to modify the strategy and tactics of propaganda. Back in September 1942, Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels demanded that rumors about the alleged emergence of a "new Europe" - an interstate entity on the European continent - be resolutely stopped. At one of the meetings, he declared that Germany was fighting exclusively for material interests (oil, grain, etc.), and by no means in the name of a phantom, but precisely the idea of a "new Europe". Just a few months passed, and the tone of the statements made by the main Nazi propagandist changed dramatically. Already on February 15, 1943, Goebbels issued a circular in which he ordered to actively impose "a new, European image of German foreign policy." One of the directives stated: "It is considered inappropriate to depict the European future, which could push representatives of other peoples to the idea that they will be under German subordination for a long time." It was decided to change the vector of Nazi propaganda: the slogan "Europeans against Russian Bolshevism" was adopted, and Russia itself was portrayed as the main antagonist of Europe. It was the image of this imaginary enemy that was supposed to rally the continent under the authority of the Third Reich. This idea was repeated more than once not only by Goebbels, but also by Hitler, who called the Wehrmacht "the protective screen of the European continent." It was from this time that plans began to be developed in the Third Reich, involving the "unification" of Europe, directed against Russia. On March 13, 1943, Goebbels gave an interview to one of the Danish newspapers, in which he called the idea that Germany wanted to subjugate the European countries to its will erroneous. More

In addition, he talked about the "transformation of Europe", in which the Third Reich was allegedly ready to defend the rights of all European nations. As you can see, the idea of a "united Europe" was just a tactical step that was supposed to speed up the mobilization of forces to fight against Russia. However, in a more private setting, neither Goebbels nor Hitler wanted to hear about the independence of European states: for them, "united Europe" was just a trick.

However, propaganda is one thing, and real foreign policy is another thing, which, on the one hand, had to take into account the "trends of the times", and on the other hand, not to forget that "united Europe" was just a propaganda myth called upon in first of all, to rally the "continental forces" to fight against Russia. In 1942, the Reich Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, like other Nazi ministers, openly showed his negative attitude towards the idea of a "new Europe". He publicly showed his dissatisfaction with the planned series of radio broadcasts called "European Hour". However, even then he did not rule out the possibility of creating some kind of "European Committee" under his ministry. In the autumn of 1942, Ribbentrop continues to insist that any specifics concerning the post-war structure of Europe should be avoided at all costs. The process of creating a "European Committee" in the structure of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was completely delayed. At first, Ribbentrop intended to found it after the end of the "French campaign", that is, after the military defeat of France. In practice, the first draft of this institution was developed only on September 26, 1942. It was then that one of the employees of the German Foreign Ministry officially voiced the idea of creating a special ("European") committee, which was to be personally headed by Ribbentrop. The assessment of this project was entrusted to the SS officer Werner Best, who held the post of ministerial director in the structure of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. By and large, the European Committee was forgotten for several months. The situation changed only after Stalingrad. This time, Ribbentrop decided not to wait for the initiative of his subordinates, and therefore he himself developed the main documents that were supposed to contribute to the "unification" of Europe. On March 21, 1943, he prepared a memorandum that was to be put on Hitler's desk. In this document, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Reich decided to declare the need to create a "European Federation". In particular, it noted that Ribbentrop had previously assumed such a possibility. However, he

did not in any way connect the idea of a federation with the defeat of the German troops at Stalingrad; on the contrary, he pointed out that its creation was to be marked by "major German military successes." Initially, the "European Federation" was supposed to include: Germany, Italy, France, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Serbia, Greece and Spain. The foundation of the federation was to take place on the territory of the "Ostmark" (as the former Austria was called in the Reich) either in Salzburg or in Vienna. According to Ribbentrop, the creation of a "European Federation" could solve several problems, including drawing countries that adhered to neutrality into the Second World War on the side of Germany. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was not so much worried about Switzerland as Sweden, Portugal, and also the position of Turkey. But still, the main goal of the "European Federation" was its opposition to Russia. Ribbentrop noted in his document: "The Russians would feel that Russia was opposed to all of Europe, and therefore Russian military power would be weakened."

It seems important that Ribbentrop in his note mentions the plans of the Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler. For some reason, it is generally accepted that the head of the Foreign Ministry and the chief of the SS did not get along very well with each other. Like, Himmler was a fanatical Nazi, and Ribbentrop was a conservative diplomat. But this is nothing more than a delusion. Himmler had known von Ribbentrop since the end of 1932, when negotiations were underway in the latter's house to form a government headed by Hitler. Moreover, in May 1933, Himmler promoted Ribbentrop to the SS Standartenführer, and on April 20, 1940, he was promoted to the rank of SS Obergruppenführer. Ribbentrop not only collaborated with the SD, but was also considered a personal friend of Himmler (as far as Himmler could be friends with representatives of the political elite of the Reich). On the eve of his appointment as Reich Foreign Minister, Ribbentrop and his wife arrived to spend the night at Himmler's house. In February 1939, Margaretha Himmler, who, along with

Ribbentrop rested in a sanatorium, described him in her diary as a "family friend". Therefore, it is not surprising that Himmler decided to combine the plans for an "SS-centric Europe" with the plans for a "European Federation" that had been developed by Ribbentrop. The Reich Foreign Minister reported this separately to Hitler: "I have already discussed with Himmler that under certain circumstances we could form several first-class SS units from Europeans who would be impressed by our European slogans.

They could be a valuable addition to our struggle. The details of this project have already been thought out to the smallest detail and will be discussed separately with Himmler in the very near future. However, without the mentioned slogans, all these undertakings will not be successful." As you can see, the "united Europe", developed in the bowels of the SS Main Directorate by Alexander Dolezalek, and the "European Federation", proposed by the imperial MILD, were not competing, but complementary projects. There were minor differences in these projects, but this did not change the situation as a whole.

Despite the many arguments given in favor of creating a "European Federation", Hitler resolutely refused to implement this project. Ribbentrop himself saw in the "European Federation" something more than just a propaganda tool. In those days, he wrote: "Any statements about a new Europe, newspaper articles and other actions, in my opinion, are not only meaningless, but also harmful, since they reduce the power of the propaganda effect that we could achieve by the very fact of establishing [“a European Federation”]. Ribbentrop intended to combine two seemingly incompatible projects: > National Socialist Greater German Reich and a federal Europe. However, these projects had one common component - an anti-Russian orientation. And it is far from accidental that the idea of creating this kind of hybrid began to arise when a radical turning point in the war was outlined in the bloody battles near Stalingrad. It cannot be said that Ribbentrop's projects turned out to be completely unclaimed. For example, modern united Europe (with only a slight change in “authorship”) has brought them to life. The ideas of "a European economy built in a customs-free space through common and unified planning" were put into practice. And the European Union borrowed a rare hypocrisy from Ribbentrop's "European Federation". According to official documents, the "European Federation" was planned in order to "protect the European continent from external enemies." In practice, its creation was supposed to be the next step to continue the aggressive war that was unleashed against Russia. In the Third Reich, any declarative assurances about “sovereignty”, about “freedom”, about the “fateful interconnection of European peoples” (namely, such vocabulary was used in Ribbentrop's “European project”) were just a screen behind which the intention to continue the war on the Eastern Front was hidden. .

The Battle of Stalingrad and the radical change in the course of the war forced the Nazi leadership to look for new forms of strategic and tactical planning, which fully applied to foreign policy. Despite the fact that Hitler rejected the plan to create a "European Federation", the Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop, who proposed it, decided not to stop developing the "European project". He preferred to focus his attention on the "European Committee", the creation of which was planned as early as 1941-1942. But officially this committee came into being only on April 5, 1943. It included, including Ribbentrop himself, fourteen diplomats. The work of the committee was almost secret. It is known that it was divided into three working groups. The meetings of the "European Committee" were held in a confidential atmosphere. From the few surviving documents, it was clear that "in the present phase of the conduct of the war, the main task of the committee is the preparation of documents and proposals concerning the post-war transformation of Europe." And further: "The development of specific plans for the design of the future of Europe is not a priority." In the Imperial Foreign Office itself, only a few knew about the existence of the committee. It can be assumed that, contrary to Hitler's ban, Ribbentrop, together with Himmler, continued to develop a program for the "unification of Europe." This is evidenced by the document prepared on September 9, 1943, which contained 17 theses of the “transformation of Europe”. Noting that “the unification of Europe was historically inevitable

process", the authors of the document pointed out that the united European peoples were to form a "united front against Bolshevism" (thesis XI). In fact, this was a development of the idea that Russia was the enemy of a "united Europe", and therefore the so-called "European equilibrium" had to give way to "European solidarity" (thesis X). If we evaluate the document as a whole, then we can confidently say that it was a slight development of the idea of a "European Federation" once proposed by Ribbentrop. The intonations and notes were new, clearly indicating that Germany retained the position of "continental hegemon" ("the unification of Europe was started by Germany", "Germany strives for the unification of Europe", etc.), which was only partially veiled by phrases about "voluntariness" unification and preservation of the European countries of their state "sovereignty". But for all that, it was emphasized that any state had to "be loyal to Europe" and was obliged to "actively cooperate in resolving

common European tasks. Since the agenda was to be determined by the Third Reich, in practice these items were supposed to mean unquestioning submission to Germany and active participation in all her undertakings. Only in this way can one understand what the US thesis meant: "The task of the new European order is to eliminate the causes that in the past were a pretext for intra-European wars, the end of the era of 4 intra-European wars and the overcoming of European particularism." It doesn't take a visionary to read between the lines: "Waging wars outside a united Europe and legitimizing German hegemony." Again, Thesis IX stated that the "Axis countries" (read: Germany) were supposed to guarantee Europe protection from external aggression.

The need to disguise Germany's dominant position on the Continent was noted by many German diplomats. For example, in the "Proposals for the unification of the European and East Asian policy of large spaces" prepared at the end of February 1943, adviser Kolb noted: "The fear prevails in Europe that National Socialist Germany wants to impose its will on the European peoples." It is difficult to say whether the diplomat understood or not that these fears were by no means groundless. In any case, Kolb proposed to unite all states within the framework of the "new Europe", regardless of their form of government: totalitarian, monarchical or parliamentary. Such remarks clearly indicate that the idea of a "united Europe" was not so much political as geopolitical. "Ordering" the policy of large areas on the one hand in Europe, on the other hand in the Far East, was based on only one message - the folding of a powerful bloc oriented against Russia. Just as the political character of "united Europe" did not play any role, so it did not matter what the political system was in Russia itself. The traditional reservations about Bolshevism were more propagandistic than strategic. The "united Europe" designed in the Third Reich, under any circumstances, had to resist Russia.

Gradually, the idea of creating a "European Federation" began to gain, if not universal, but still noticeable popularity among Nazi diplomats. In the summer of 1943, Ambassador Hans Frowine, who at one time took part in the activities of a special Parisian delegation, presented his developments to the Ribbentrop court.

was to make peace between France and the Reich. On June 7, 1943, he sent to Berlin "Main Considerations for the Plan for a New Europe". In it, he proposed the formation of a "European Community", whose members were to conclude a special "European Pact". Of particular interest was his idea of establishing a "European Court", which, no doubt, was reproduced in the modern European Union. However, the German diplomat Cecile von Renthe-Fink was more proactive. On September 6, 1943, he submitted a memorandum to Ribbentrop, in which he proposed measures to adapt the idea of a "European Federation" to the requirements of the National Socialist regime. Already in the preamble, this politician noted that the need for integration processes in Europe increased in direct proportion to how the war dragged on. Cecil von Renthe-Fink suggested: "It is very important to awaken and constantly maintain the hope among the peoples of Europe that the victory of the German

weapon gives the continent order, long-awaited peace, national independence, material well-being and social justice. Germany waged this struggle as the vanguard of a new, better order in which all European peoples will be given their rightful place. After a long discussion about the national interests of individual peoples, the German diplomat finally reveals the true objectives of this project: "If we win the war, then Germany's influence in Europe will be so great that we can at any time carry out our intentions in the political, economic and military spheres, without recourse to special agreements. As they say, winners are not judged. In the name of victory in the world war, the National Socialists were ready to support the idea of "European integration" and conditional national sovereignty, so that after the alleged defeat of Russia, they would again establish sole control over the continent. Taking into account that Cecile von Renthe-Fink was a career diplomat and did not belong to the number of fanatical Nazis, one can once again confirm the idea that "united Europe" as the main enemy of Russia could have any political color. Only in the Nazi version was the anti-Russian component of the project more pronounced. One of the German diplomats of that time recalled: "We had to write for psychopaths, competing with all the same psychopaths." When Wipert von Blucher, the German ambassador to Finland, arrived from Helsinki in Berlin in the summer of 1943, his "old colleagues" assured him almost in unison that in the future the war against Russia would be waged by "a

federal basis Europe". Although, for this reason, there is no point in discussing what was the ratio of Nazis and conservatives in the German Foreign Ministry: both the European Federation and the Great German Reich would have continued the "campaign to the East".

When studying modern textbooks on European law and textbooks on European studies, it is literally striking that their authors (both Russian and European) persistently avoid plots related to the preparation of European integration by the Nazis. In these books, the history of the formation of a "united Europe" is interrupted by the initiative of Aristide Briand (1927) and resumed from the Hertenstein Conference (1946). Any reader might get the impression that in the two decades that separate these events, not a single attempt has been made to create something that even remotely resembles the modern European Union. All the more surprising is the fact that all the main European integration developments were made during the years of the Nazi dictatorship. It is doubly surprising that the Europeans, so proud of their past, diligently try to forget the real history. Is it because constructions like "united Europe" can have any political connotation, but retain an invariable anti-Russian core?

Chapter 3. Was there an anti-fascist? (TO

history of one document)

In November 1941, in the Third Reich, a memorandum was presented to the Secretary of State of the Imperial Foreign Office, Weizsäcker, which dealt with the possible arrangement of a "post-war Europe." The author of this document was Professor Albrecht Haushofer, son of the famous founder of geopolitics as a science, Karl Haushofer. It was assumed that on the basis of this memorandum a report was to be prepared for Hitler. Starting his reasoning with the fact that "the events of recent years have demonstrated that the anarchy of many sovereign states, unregulated by painful international law, has been stopped," Albrecht Haushofer offered the Fuhrer his vision of the future of Europe. In terms of its volume, the document resembled rather a small book, and therefore, thoughts and ideas related to the "arrangement" of Russia are of particular interest to us. Proceeding from the fact that "in the modern world war, not one of the world powers could claim absolute victory, i.e., dictate over the continent," Albrecht Haushofer suggested taking into account that "the Asian power core of the Great Russians - in the Stalinist or other form - will be preserved from the Volga or from the Urals up to Lake Baikal. The conclusion that a purely military-forced subjugation of "Russian Eurasia" was as unlikely as the subjugation of China ended with a number of practical proposals. First, Haushofer spoke of "the problem of the geopolitical isolation of Stalin (and

Great Russians) in Siberia. In this regard, it was stated: "Stalin or his followers, who can adhere to both the ideas of world revolution and Great Russian nationalism, will be tactically interested in being included in the negotiation process," from which, in fact, they had to be isolated. To ease the "Siberian isolation", Haushofer generously offered not to conquer Russia east of the line: the White Sea - Lake Onega - Volkhov - Central Russian Upland - Don - the mouth of the Volga. The reason for such a striking "nobility" lay in the fact that the author of the document considered the Russians (as well as the Serbs) to be a people who for a long time would not be able to come to terms with the German dictates. It is very significant that, in accordance with the racial laws of the Third Reich,

a quarter of Jews Albrecht Haushofer ranked among the "anti-German peoples" European Jews ("primarily Eastern European Jews").

The program of "overcoming the Great Russian problem" proposed by Albrecht Haushofer provided for a number of measures to dismember Russia (read: the USSR). It was proposed to grant conditional independence to the Baltic states. Karelia was supposed to go to Finland, which supposedly was supposed to ensure the security of the entire northern Scandinavia from some kind of "Great Russian threat." Speaking about depriving Russia of access to the seas, Haushofer pointedly alluded to the "fate of St. Petersburg." By and large, the entire northern Russia was to come under the control of the Reich and its satellites. A similar fate awaited Ukraine, Belarus and the Caucasus. Haushofer spoke of the creation of a "belt of states" that was not controlled by Moscow, which was supposed to stretch from Belarus through Ukraine to the Caucasus and end in the Hindu Kush. Outwardly, this process had to be disguised as the rise of the national self-consciousness of a number of peoples, ethnic groups and tribes. In fact, it was supposed to develop and cultivate Russophobic sentiments in the mentioned areas in every possible way. Criticism of Bolshevism had to be conditional, since first of all it was necessary to arouse hatred for the "Great Russians". The encouragement of Russophobia was to take place at the suggestion of Albrecht Haushofer through the formation of a new political and cultural "elite" of those ethnic groups that would be allowed to receive their own statehood under German patronage.

The practical plan for the geopolitical isolation of the Russian people in Siberia is noteworthy, if only for several reasons. Firstly, the German geopolitics was not at all interested in the ideological component of this project: with or without the Bolsheviks, with or without Stalin, but the Russians had to find themselves in geopolitical isolation. Secondly, this plan was prepared by a man who was customarily called a "conservative anti-fascist" in Russian historiography. The reason for this kind of conclusion was two arrests and the "Moabite Sonnets", which were written by Albrecht Haushofer in the winter of 1944-1945, that is, on the eve of how he was shot without trial or investigation in Berlin. But in practice, it turned out that the document quoted above was written immediately after Haushofer Jr. was released after the first arrest from the Gestapo prison. In 1941 he was treated in

correct in the highest measure, and the two-month stay in the casemates did not in any way damage his physical and mental well-being. And the pretext for the arrest was by no means the imaginary anti-fascist activities of Albrecht Haushofer. He was not unreasonably suspected of organizing the flight of Rudolf Hess to England, which the Deputy Fuhrer for the party made in May 1941. Albrecht Haushofer, although not a National Socialist, but thanks to his close acquaintance with Rudolf Hess and Joachim von Ribbentrop, made a swift and brilliant career in the diplomatic sphere. He was considered an expert in secret diplomatic missions, for which in the corridors of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Albrecht was nicknamed "His Most Serene Eminence" ("gray eminence"). To the great dismay of Karl Haushofer, his son did not share anti-English views, nor was he enthusiastic about the idea of a "Eurasian axis: Berlin - Moscow - Tokyo", which the creator of geopolitics had been nurturing since the 1920s. On the contrary, Albrecht Haushofer favored the British, being in the UK on special missions numerous times.

In early August 1940, Rudolf Hess, unexpectedly for Albrecht Haushofer, started a conversation with him about fate. At the same time, the Deputy Fuhrer did not hint at a word what prompted him to conduct such conversations. Somewhat later, he nevertheless informed Haushofer Jr. that Hitler did not intend to continue military operations against Great Britain. Such a decision was dictated by racial and political considerations. Hitler believed that Germany should not be interested in the military defeat of England, as this could lead to the fall of white power in India and Indochina. After some time, Rudolf Hess asked Albrecht Haushofer if he had retained his ties with the British. Of particular interest were "far-sighted politicians". In response, Haushofer Jr. hinted in no uncertain terms that National Socialist Germany had long past its limit of trust. Therefore, any attempt to contact the British was meaningless. Apparently, Rudolf Hess was dissatisfied with this reaction, since a few days later he turned to Karl Haushofer with a similar question. The conversation turned out to be very frank. Although Hess did not explain what caused his concern. He decided to keep secret Hitler's intention to attack the USSR. As a result, in September 1940, the doubtful Haushofer Sr. asked his son to write a letter to Hamilton Douglas. In this letter, it was proposed to organize on the territory of one of

neutral countries meeting with Rudolf Hess. The letter was sent to England in a roundabout way, and therefore reached the addressee only in April 1941.

Since there was no answer from London, Rudolf Hess began to look for other opportunities to start "peace" negotiations. It is possible that Hitler knew about this initiative and, in principle, supported it. In the spring of 1941, the Haushofers again became involved in this "peace-loving" operation. After long conversations and disputes, the father could not keep his son from traveling to Geneva, where he was supposed to meet with Karl Jacob Burckhardt. He was a public figure known for his extensive connections in London. In addition, he always expressed dissatisfaction with the fact that Germany was at war with Great Britain. The day before leaving for Geneva, Albrecht Haushofer spoke about his mission to his mother. She noted in her diary: "Only if my approval could help this enterprise, then it would certainly succeed. But Albrecht and I do not believe in success. But you still have to try." On May 3, 1941, Albrecht called home from Switzerland and said that his mission had not completely failed and that there was still a chance of success. He planned to return home and tell all the details. However, events soon began to follow each other like in a kaleidoscope. On May 10, 1941, Rudolf Hess, without waiting for the return of Albrecht Haushofer, flew to Great Britain in his plane. He decided to act at his own peril and risk, wanting to force the British to start "peace" negotiations.

By and large, most of the geopolitical projects proposed by the Germans in 1940-1941 provided for the creation of a semblance of a "united Europe", which in turn was dictated by the need to force Britain to conclude a separate peace with the Third Reich. Hitler, as the "legitimate" representative of a "united Europe", including the puppet states created on the territory of the USSR, had to change the position of the British government. By and large, the plan prepared by Albrecht Haushofer in November 1941 was nothing more than an attempt to get Britain out of the war. It is this assumption that makes it possible to understand the essence of the passages that in the "Siberian isolation" Stalin should have been deprived of the possibility of contact with the "sea powers". Albrecht Haushofer reported to Rudolf Hess on September 8, 1940 about the possibility of achieving peace between the Reich and Great Britain on the basis of an anti-Russian policy. He reported: "In my opinion, the present war has taught us that Europe has become too tiny for

to lead a past hectic lifestyle. A new order directed against Russian Eurasia in the name of maintaining peace throughout the world is possible only under the condition of the closest Anglo-German cooperation. It cannot be said that the project of Albrecht Haushofer remained a project: firstly, many of his ideas were adopted by the occupying authorities, and secondly, immediately after the writing of this memorandum, it was announced that the Anti-Comintern Pact was extended, to which by November 1941, many European countries have already joined.

So, the "Moabite Sonnets" and the execution of Albrecht Haushofer that followed in the spring of 1945 were the only moments that made it possible for many years to talk about the anti-fascism of this specialist in covert diplomatic operations. It must be admitted that even the author of this material did not immediately pay attention to the fact that the second arrest of Albrecht Haushofer took place at the end of 1944, and therefore could not be connected in any way with the 1944 conspiracy case. By this time, the investigation was completed, and all participants in the conspiracy were executed. It is impossible not to pay attention to the fact that no charges were brought against Haushofer Jr., and in April 1945 he was shot without trial or investigation. The Reich so quickly got rid of not so much anti-fascists as unnecessary witnesses. Similarly, the sadistic SS doctor Sigmund Rascher was executed, whom the National Socialist authorities themselves accused of systematically kidnapping children. In this regard, we must ask ourselves: was there an anti-fascist? Nothing but the Moabite Sonnets speaks of Albrecht Haushofer's anti-fascism. He made plans for the dismemberment of Russia and faithfully carried out secret missions entrusted by the leadership of the Third Reich, which caused obvious displeasure of his father, Karl Haushofer. The same father who stood up for continental peace and the geopolitical rapprochement between Russia and Germany. The same father whom his son hypocritically accused in his sonnets of helping Hitler and the National Socialists.

Chapter 4. European economic

community - the legacy of the Hitler regime

It is generally accepted that the formation of a pan-European economic space began in 1958, after the Treaty of Rome was signed, on the basis of which the European Economic Community (EEC) was created. However, a more detailed study of historical facts suggests that the main development of the principles of the EEC took place much earlier. According to a large account, this process was started in 1940, when, in the course of fleeting hostilities, German troops captured Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France. In fact, immediately in various ministries and authorities of the Third Reich, plans began to emerge for the management of the occupied territories. On May 30, 1940, the German diplomat Karl August Clodius proposed to the leadership of the Imperial Foreign Office that Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg and Norway be integrated into the so-called "Great German economic space". Literally two days later, another diplomat - Ritter - proposed the formation of a "global economic space", which was supposed to cover territories with a total population of more than 200 million people (including Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway). In the future, the countries of the Danube region, Finland, Sweden and the Baltic states should have been poured into it. At the same time, Werner Deitz showed his own initiative, who, as early as September 1939, initiated the creation of the "Society for European Economic Planning and the Economy of Large Spaces." On May 31, 1940, Werner Deitz prepared a memorandum in which he proposed the creation of an Imperial Commissariat for the Economy of Large Spaces.

In this document, Werner Deitz noted that the "liberal empire of the pound sterling" (the British Empire) built on maritime trade was to disintegrate, giving life to several monetary and economic blocs: the dollar bloc, the yen bloc, the rupee bloc and the continental bloc of the mark. The blockade of England during the outbreak of the Second World War was bound to accelerate this process.

Deitz stressed that the blockade as a military-political means had to be supplemented by measures to form a pan-European continental economy, which would certainly be under German control. In the future, it was planned to form a single economic community that would stretch "from Gibraltar to the Urals, from the North Cape to the island of Cyprus." The slogan of the proposed unification was to be the words: "Europe for Europeans." Indicative is the fact that the future European economic community had to consider Siberia, the Mediterranean and Africa as areas for subsequent colonization. Created with the outbreak of World War II, the "Society for European Economic Planning and the Economy of Large Spaces" was considered by Werner

Daitz as the first step towards the formation of a global continental economy. Oddly enough, the society was formally subordinate to the Imperial Ministry of Education, although in practice it was engaged in organizing cooperation between many economic structures. But still, the Society for European Economic Planning was primarily a scientific structure that developed options for transforming the European economy. If only for this reason, the emergence of a purely political institution was required, dealing with the practical implementation of existing developments. At the suggestion of Deitz, this was to be the Imperial Commissariat for the Economy of Large Spaces. The idea of competition between the planned economy of the Soviet Union and the planned European economic community seems interesting. However, Deitz's phrase about "future military goals" suggests that the formation of the European Economic Community was aimed at accelerating preparations for the outbreak of war against the USSR.

It can be noted that the plans proposed by Clodius, Ritter and Deitz were largely "euphoric" in nature. To paraphrase the famous title of Stalin's article, one could say that in those days many "were dizzy from the successes on the Western Front." A certain portion of sobering was made by the decisions adopted on August 9, 1940 by the Trade Policy Committee, which included representatives from various ministries. They clearly stated: "If possible, stop the discussion of German plans for the economic restructuring of Europe." As a result, the first project adopted in the depths of the Imperial Ministry of Economics for the transfer of the German economy to a "war footing" was more reminiscent of a document born during Kaiser Germany than

during the years of the National Socialist dictatorship, focused on the "economy of large spaces." But even in this variant it contained several highly revealing passages. First, it was made clear that the coming economic transformation of Europe was due to the victories of the Wehrmacht, and that in subsequent years the economy would be of a military nature - a clear indication of expansion to the East. Secondly, the military-economic policy of the Reich was focused on stopping the "Balkanization of Europe", which in turn supposedly should have contributed to an increase in the level of well-being of Europeans. At the same time, customs barriers should have been eliminated between European countries, and a common European currency should have appeared - naturally, it should have been the Reichsmark. In Europe itself, a "division of labor" was to take place, that is, the elimination of competition and the curtailment of duplicating industries in a number of countries.

As you can see, the position of the structures and authorities of the Third Reich was very controversial. On the one hand, there was talk about the coming European Economic Community, on the other hand, officials were very reserved about this topic. This was noted even by foreign observers. Particular attention was drawn to the position of the Reichs Minister of Economics and the President of the Reichsbank, Walter Funk. On July 25, 1940, he made a separate statement. In his speech, Funk touched only in passing on the topic of a common European economy, noting the need to "strengthen the sense of solidarity of the European peoples and promote cooperation in all areas of the economy." At the same time, he noted that the main goal of the future European economy was to be the provision of the "Greater German space" and the well-being of the German people. Something similar Funk said a few days earlier: "Germany has all the political power in Europe, and therefore the transformation of the economy will meet its needs. We have the political will to use this power. All countries should look up to us. The economies of individual European countries must be adapted to our needs.

As you can see, the statements were extremely frank. At the same time, Funk's deputy, State Secretary of the Imperial Ministry of Economics Gustav Schlotterer, took a more flexible position. Of course, he in no way challenged the idea of the economic dictates of the Third Reich. But at the same time, he was well aware that it was impossible to achieve

the desired result only by coercive measures. Schlotterer tried to organize "voluntary" cooperation between German industrialists and their European colleagues. Exactly

Schlotterer was the initiator of the formation of a unified European transport system and a rationalized European industry. When he was an employee of the Imperial Ministry of Economics, Schlotterer emphasized: "Economic Pan-Europe does not imply the unification of states, but the unification of national economies on the basis of agreements concluded between nations." This motto was first supported by the industrialists of coal and steel from the Ruhr; those who some time later, after the war, became one of the first initiators of European integration, then still at the stage of creating the European Coal and Steel Community.

It should be noted that the question of forming a European economic community was divided between many different ministries and authorities of the Third Reich. In addition to the Reich Ministry of Economics, it was also dealt with by specialists from the Reich Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Also, over time, the structures of the SS and the Imperial Ministry of the Occupied Eastern Territories (A. Rosenberg) joined the struggle for the "European economy". It should be noted that the development of the same problem was formally independently dealt with by a huge number of smaller departments:

- the previously mentioned "Society for European Economic Planning and the Economy of Large Spaces",
- Central Research Institute of National Economy and Global Economy,
- Imperial Office for the Study of Spaces and Regional Planning,
- German Society for the World Economy,
- Scientific Institute of the German Labor Front,
- Institute of World Economics at the University of Kiel,
- Institute for Global Economics at Heidelberg University, etc. d.

A favorite topic of National Socialist economists was the idea of a global economy, which since 1942 was embodied in the idea of the so-called European Economic Community. The term was first used by Werner Deitz in 1916. It was assumed that this idea was to be an economic complement to the theory of

"living space". At first, it was thought to create a kind of Hanseatic association of a continental scale. But gradually the idea was turned into the idea of the need to create an imperial planned economy, where centralized power was to regulate the economic and economic relations of individual European regions and territories. Already in August 1939, a special group "War Economics" was created under the High Command of the Wehrmacht, which began to study the problems of the economy of large spaces in war conditions. The global economy was supposed to become a tool to "create an economic basis for political domination in Europe" (naturally, it was about the domination of the Third Reich). The idea of a European economic community continued to be developed in the Third Reich until the very end of World War II. But National Socialist theorists could not solve the problem of coordinating national economies. In 1944, Professor Erich von Sievers wrote about the "blatant uncertainty" in addressing the problems of a global supranational economy. However, this did not prevent the majority of ideological economists from agreeing that a single European economy was supposed to ensure the self-sufficiency of the continent.

There were two schools in the Third Reich, two different approaches to the problem of the European economic community. Werner Deitz adhered to a biological point of view, which suggested that a common economy could only be created among ethnically related peoples. Other authors adhered to a pragmatic approach, that is, they were guided by common economic goals. Many more approaches emerged from the discussion

the issue of the sovereignty of individual countries of the "New Europe", which were to enter the European Economic Community. Werner Deitz insisted on the "zeroing" of state sovereignty in favor of the so-called "sovereignty of nations" - his phraseology was closest to the constructions of the National Socialist theorists who planned to form a new system of international law. However, some of the German economists spoke in favor of the independence of the European states, which were to form the European Economic Community. It was their constructions that were used in the 50s in the preparation of the "Treaties of Rome" - it was decided not to even change the terminology, adopting the slogan of creating a European economic community, so popular in the Third Reich.

Probably, Arno Selzer turned out to be the most far-sighted of all, who even during the years of dictatorship insisted on observing the principle of voluntariness when entering the European Economic Community. In one of his articles, he stated: "Peace and prosperity in Europe cannot be maintained for a long time with the help of bayonets and soldiers' boots." One can also single out the constructions of the representative of the IG Farben concern, Dr. Anton Ratering, who suggested that European economic cooperation should be based on the principles of good neighborliness and mutual support. The economy of large spaces in his understanding was supposed to be a social good for all peoples. He wrote: "We must think not in the Great German spirit, but in the European way, in the best sense of the word. It seems to me that we, as Europeans, should strive to ensure that Europe, based on the discoveries and achievements of our time, becomes a political, economic and cultural community." However, these "good intentions" did not change the National Socialist vector of most economic constructions.

It would be fundamentally wrong to believe that the economic plans for post-war Europe were built only in the Third Reich. Similar attempts were made in England and the USA. Only taking into account this information, one can understand the essence of the special report prepared in 1943 by Karl August Clodius "On the economic transformation of Europe." It dealt not so much with a real restructuring of the European economy as with an attempt to give a propagandist response to "Western projects". The German diplomat emphasized in his report that the plan proposed by Germany for the "positive" transformation of post-war Europe could become the most effective means of psychologically influencing the European peoples. Clodius wrote: "The discussion of this topic by the European public was able to strengthen the peoples in the feeling that Germany considers it quite natural that the European nations after the victory achieved have the right to determine their own destiny under German patronage." The aforementioned European public was asked to present several theses. It was suggested that the war be presented as nothing more than an attempt by Germany to ensure economic independence for Europe. In this case, it was a kind of continental autarchy. But it was not to be turned into continental isolation. The cooperation of large spaces was supposed to give impetus to the development of the whole world. Ensure economic cooperation

and some kind of European economic solidarity was planned through the following means: a ban on the purchase of goods outside the continent, if any in Europe; a ban on the sale of goods outside Europe until such time as there was a demand for them in Europe itself; prices for European agricultural products were to be set independently of the "world market" ("If, after the end of the war, European agriculture found itself in a state of free competition with overseas producers, this would mean collapse for some European countries"); elimination of customs borders within Europe; introduction of a common European currency.

As the Second World War entered new stages, more and more ministries were involved in the project to create a European Economic Community. After Albert Speer became the head of the Imperial Ministry of Armaments and Ammunition, this structure also decided to participate in the transformation of the European economy. The new minister re-formed the planning department, at the head of which he put senior government adviser Arnold Köster. After working for some time in a new position, in the fall of 1943, Köster prepared a memorandum, which he called "European

economic planning". This document noted that Germany used the occupied territories exclusively by force, which was not entirely appropriate. The author of the document correctly noted that the exploitation of the local population led to an increase in hostility, passive resistance and sabotage. In order to achieve a truly total mobilization of the European economy, Köster proposed the creation of a special Office for European Economic Planning. Of course, Germany was to remain the continental hegemon, but the overt exploitation, violence and coercion had to be disguised, not so obvious.

Summing up some results, we can confidently say that the integration processes that began in the European economy at the end of the 40s, in particular the creation of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (and then the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Economic Community), were by no means random. Adopted on a very revealing date - May 9, 1950 - the "Schumann Declaration" only to a person not privy to the details of history could seem like a qualitatively new moment in the history of the development of Europe. Reasoning about "concrete actions called at the beginning

to ensure European solidarity in practice" turned out to be a copy of the economic projects of the Third Reich in practice. The "European Economic Community" as a concept arose in Kaiser's Germany, but as an idea it was formalized precisely during the years of the National Socialist dictatorship. In this regard, one can hardly be surprised that at present the German economy has become a kind of dictator in the economic life of Europe. Only one question remains open: if the Third Reich planned to use the European Economic Community as an economic basis for starting a war against the USSR, then for what kind of war is it now planned to use this global economy?

Chapter 5. "The Fourth European Integration":

path of aggression and enslavement

It would be a mistake to believe that the projects for the unification of the European space developed during the years of the National Socialist dictatorship were all pan-German, aggressive and racial-biological. In those years, Germany had its exceptions. For example, the Young Conservative publicist August Winnig, who at one time broke away from the Social Democrats, published a work in 1938 called "Europe - the thoughts of a German." On the pages of this book, he managed not to mention either Hitler or National Socialism. Winnig believed that Christianity should have become the unifying component of Europe. The Berlin professor A. Brinkman, who also published a book in 1938 on the problem of European unification, did not adhere to the national socialist postulates. The "Spirit of Nations" (that was the name of this work) was an attempt to lay the foundation for mutual understanding of European nations, which in turn, according to Brinkman, was to lead to the formation of the "European Community". The professor even allowed himself some bold ideas, for example, declaring that there is a higher duty than serving one's Fatherland. For such passages, the book immediately came under fire from National Socialist observers. One of them wrote: "The Spirit of Nations does not need to be condemned, since the book has already passed judgment on itself. No one has yet made an attempt to show the German view of things in such a perverted form ... The author is an undoubted supporter of international friendship and international cooperation.

However, Gieseler Wirsing's example was the most revealing. He could hardly be called an anti-fascist, but nevertheless in his "European developments" he tried to distance himself from the ideas of National Socialist expansionism. Wirzing was essentially a typical opportunist intellectual who agreed to serve a criminal regime. Being a native of the environment of conservative-revolutionary circles, Gieseler Wirzing for quite a long time studied attempts to unite the European space. In his book *The Age of Icarus*, he tried to state his conclusions without resorting to

National Socialist Phraseology. He mainly speculated about the national distribution of "great spaces". In fact, the author of this book came to the conclusion about the need for federalism, which he emphasized in his early work *Intermediate Europe and German Destiny*, which was published in 1932, that is, a year before Hitler came to power. Some of Wirzing's ideas seem extremely interesting. For example, he considered World War II to be the fourth attempt to unify Europe. The previous three were: the Napoleonic Empire, the "Holy Alliance" and the system created by Aristide Briand (this work would be good to study by modern specialists in European history and European law, who count the beginning of the European integration process from the 50s of the twentieth century). According to Wirzing, all attempts to unite Europe were doomed to failure - for this reason, he compared Europe with Icarus, which, flying up to the Sun, inevitably loses its wings and falls down like a stone. Wirzing even made a prophetic suggestion in his own way. Without any doubt that the "fourth attempt to unify Europe" would end in complete failure, he said: "Germany and Japan were drawn into the war, since England did not have the right to claim world domination. However, it will go to the Moloch giants, the universal monsters - Americanism and Sovietism, which will turn Europe and Asia into an arena of endless confrontation with each other. Whatever the views of Gieseler Wirzing at heart, his book was published in 1944, when he was editor-in-chief of the well-known propaganda magazine *Signal*.

Perhaps there is a need to repeat the common truth: exceptions just confirm the rule. The works of Winnig, Brinkmann and Wirzing were merely derivatives of the gigantic work that was being done in the Third Reich, which began the "fourth European integration." When the book "*The Age of Icarus*" was printed, the plans for the creation of a "European Confederation" were nurtured not only in the Imperial Foreign Office. By 1944, even the so-called "war of memorandums", caused by the beginning of aggression against the USSR, began to subside. In 1941-1942, numerous structures and functionaries of the Reich literally competed with each other, offering numerous projects for the exploitation and use of the "eastern occupied territories." Of all these documents, attention should be paid to the report of the General Commissioner of the Crimea, Alfred Frauenfeld, who in the past was Gauleiter of Vienna. Frauenfeld

belonged to the so-called "national socialist utilitarians", and therefore he proposed using possible European integration processes to enhance the exploitation of the Soviet occupied territories. He did not believe in the power of terror, but he did not doubt the ultimate goals of the coming colonial policy. This document automatically leads us to a new memorandum, which was prepared in June 1944 by Walter Labs, senior adviser to the Imperial Ministry for the Eastern Territories. They were offered a new system of management of the "eastern territories". Labs proceeded from the fact that the result of the war was to be the folding of the "European Confederation", in which "the decisive leadership, based on its natural, military and economic power, was to be carried out by the Reich." Like Frauenfeld, Labs did not believe that the "Eastern Territories" could be controlled by force alone. It was proposed to pour the "eastern territories" into the "united Europe". Labs was extremely frank: "This should be done not from a sense of peacefulness, but from the positions of a sober and realistic policy." Actually, the proposed recipe was very simple: in order to increase exploitation, it was necessary to give an imaginary feeling of being included in the "European space" on the rights of "equal participants". Labs cited numerous examples of how open enslavement and open conversion of the "eastern territories" into colonies would lead to the opposite result, namely, to intensify the struggle of the local population against the German occupation. And further: "Taking into account the nature of the Eastern peoples, the Reich cannot now count on their devotion and gratitude. Therefore, large parts of the Wehrmacht and the German police must inevitably be present in the eastern territories. However, measures to manage these territories must be carried out imperceptibly, gradually. Since these areas were very badly devastated during the hostilities, it will be possible to put into practice the promising German policy without any problems. As you can see, a system of quiet enslavement was proposed, which was supposed to be implemented through the imposition of imaginary European standards and abstract "European ideas". Similar ideas have been expressed in

1944 and the former head of the economic department of the General Commissariat "Melitopol" Heinz von Gomer. In his view, the "European Charter" was supposed to be a kind of political ploy - in practice, no one should have presented any rights to the European peoples. "I hope I don't let myself get too

a lot when I say that a war can be lost from a political point of view even after a military victory has been won.

Despite the fact that the prospects for creating a "European Confederation" seemed very vague, if only due to the fact that Germany's military chances were shrinking every day, in the spring of 1944 an attempt was made to form a social doctrine for the future "united European space". From 14 to 19 March, a conference was held in the Silesian town of Bad Salzbrunn. Its official organizer was the German Labor Front. It was by no means a behind-the-scenes event: it was attended by delegates from seventeen European countries (mostly figures responsible for social policy). If one did not know where, when and by whom this event was held, then the documents adopted at it could seem not only harmless, but extremely progressive. The final document spoke about the right to work, recognized the differences in the social traditions of different peoples. Some of the participants were to meet again in October 1944 in order to take as a basis the general theses of the new social concept of society. It can even be argued that in 1944 an attempt was made to construct a social structure that some time later would be called Eurosociology. One of the key reports at the conference said: "The current war will form the principles on the basis of which the European peoples will create their social order. Neither liberalism nor Marxist Bolshevism is able to show the way for their salvation from the social crisis. From time immemorial, the healthy instincts of the European peoples have directed them against any materialistic reforms and revolutionary plans. The European peoples hope that responsible leaders will finally be able to create a truly socialist order that will meet not only the requirements of reason, but also moral justice and natural popular feelings. Thirteen years will pass and the words, directly borrowed from the speakers at the conference in Bad Salzbrunn, will sound during the signing of the Rome Treaties: "The social policy of the community is diverse ... It is necessary to improve working and living conditions in order to create the possibility of harmonization in the course of such improvements... The Treaty is regarded as a path of social progress, a continuous improvement in the lives of the peoples united in the Community."

In practice, however, the new social order did not guarantee prosperity for everyone. Prosperity was to be

"balanced" by the merciless exploitation of foreign workers, prisoners of war, and inhabitants of the occupied countries driven into slavery. It was not even planned to extend the principles of the "new social order" that was supposed to underlie the "new Europe" to them. If in 1941 there were about 3.5 million people in forced labor in the Reich, then by 1944 this figure was almost 6 million. There was no question of any "European solidarity", which was extolled by the National Socialist propagandists. Depending on the "racial value", foreign workers were divided into "guest workers" (this word was introduced into official use precisely during the dictatorship) or real slaves. A foreigner, even theoretically, could not be the boss of a German worker. "Guest workers" were forbidden to create their own professional associations. The leadership of the German Labor Front, of course, constantly declared the inadmissibility of the exploitation of foreign workers, but this was nothing more than hypocritical vanity.

By 1944, a "united Europe" was no longer a mere propaganda slogan, but an idea condoning the exploitation of German-occupied territories. It is no coincidence that, while most departments of the Third Reich were forbidden to mention the "single European space" not even as a political development, but also as an abstract idea, in the Imperial Ministry of Arms around SS Brigadeführer Hans

Krel, who led the planning department, formed the so-called "European circle". It discussed not so much the issues of the post-war development of Europe as the problems of using European labor for the production of weapons. At the same time, Richard Riedl, an entrepreneur close to the Reich Ministry of Economics, hatched his own plans for the transformation of the continent, which was supposed to provide him with cheap labor. He was a member of the Supervisory Board of Donau Chemie AG. And in the fall of 1944, he prepared a voluminous document - "The Path to Europe. Thoughts on the economic union of European states. Riedl was a pragmatist, and therefore saw post-war Europe as a federation based on a "bloc of free nations." "Germany was supposed to act as a kind of "standard-bearer", but by no means the enslaver of Europe." The Imperial Minister of Finance, Count Schwerin Krosig, who patronized Riedl, was obsessed with the idea of a "united Europe" until the very last days of the Third Reich. In the spring of 1945 (!) in one

from letters addressed to Goebbels, he reported: "Now, when it is not enough to simply go into a deaf political defense, exposing the chaos into which Europe can be plunged (this, of course, is also necessary, but clearly not enough), we need more than ever to show the world the face of the future of Europe.

As Gieseler Wirzing predicted, the "fourth European integration", covered by the events of the Second World War, ended in complete failure. But modern European politicians, apparently, heard the advice given by various functionaries of the Third Reich. The "fifth integration" did not begin with violence, not with aggression, not with conquests. But does this change its nature? Doesn't building a model of Eurosociism require a mass of those who will be openly exploited in the name of speculative ideas? Aren't the words about justice and sovereignty just a cover for a new colonial policy? However, this time European colonialism has taken on more sophisticated forms - modern European politicians cannot be denied that they are learning from the mistakes of National Socialist theorists.

Chapter 6. "Respectable Europeans",

or Who really came up with NATO?

On May 9, 1945, the head of the occupation government of Norway, the collaborationist politician Vidkun Quisling, was arrested in his private mansion located in Oslo. He was hastily tried and then shot. During the trial, Quisling tried to talk about some strange things, but they did not listen to him. And yet it was highly instructive testimony. To understand their meaning, let's go back from 1945 a few years ago. In September 1942, at the 8th congress of the Norwegian pro-Nazi National Assembly (National Unity) party, Vidkun Quisling said: "We must be good Norwegians, glorious Germans and respectable Europeans. These concepts do not exclude one another, but on the contrary, they are not conceivable without each other. This policy statement by Quisling, whose name was already a household name, and he himself was perceived as the main accomplice of the German occupation authorities, was a kind of result of the development of the program of "unification" of Europe. Quisling was one of the most active adherents of the idea of "European harmony", which meant the formation of a "united Europe", in which Norway was supposed to maintain formal autonomy.

Back in 1930, Quisling wrote the book "Russia and Us", which was very actively republished in 1942 in European countries that were under the heel of German occupation. On the pages of this work, Quisling outlined the idea of creating a "Northern Alliance", which was to include the Germans, Scandinavians, the Dutch, the British, the British dominions and the United States. According to Quisling's idea, the "Northern Alliance" was to become an effective weapon in the fight against Bolshevik Russia. In May 1933, shortly before Quisling founded the fascist National Assembly party, this Norwegian proposed the creation of a customs union, on the basis of which the "Union of Northern Peoples" was to arise. In 1937 Quisling published an article in the English quarterly magazine The British Union, in which

the vision of a "World Northern Federation" was outlined. The Third Reich, the Scandinavian states, the British, the Flemings and the Dutch were to regulate trade and financial policy, which was to

become the first step towards the formation of a global anti-Russian alliance. Quisling wrote in the said article: "The bloc of these nations - the Union of Northern Peoples - will be invincible. Such an alliance will be much more effective in the fight against Bolshevism than the bankrupt liberal-Marxist Genevan League [of Nations]. politics. Our goal will be to draw all other countries into this alliance, to bring their ruling elites into our system."

It would seem that the outbreak of the Second World War should have put an end to these plans. In any case, Quisling made a lot of efforts (albeit completely futile) to ensure that Great Britain left the anti-Hitler coalition. On October 11, 1939, he published an open letter in which he suggested that European countries stop the "fratricidal" war. However, this call was preferred not to pay attention either in England or in the Third Reich. The occupation of Norway soon followed. Quisling had to adapt his plans to the new political conditions. In February 1943, he drew up a special memorandum. In it, he wrote: "We are waging war not to defeat England or America, but in the name of a new united Europe." Quisling believed that in order to achieve the goals of the war, it was imperative to solve its main issue - the "Russian problem": "The Russian problem is the main issue of modern world politics." Quisling was well aware that a purely military conquest of Russia was hardly possible. For this reason, the Norwegian fascist suggested that in relation to Russia, the "new united Europe" should have pursued a policy in the style of "divide and rule." Quisling wrote: "The proposed plan involves the separation from Russia of the following territories: Eastern Karelia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belo-Ruthenia [part of Belarus and Eastern Ukraine - Approx. author], Western Ukraine, Bessarabia, Crimea, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, - in general, inhabited by 50 million people. Russia will have approximately 20 million square kilometers of territory with 140 million inhabitants, which will be opposed by 360 million inhabitants of Europe (excluding the British Isles). But even under these conditions, Russia will still retain the prerequisites to remain a world-class power. We must make her a supporter of the continental system." At the same time, Russia, as a "continental satellite", was supposed to

be divided into many "self-governing" territories, very reminiscent of "peasant republics". The power of the new "Russian" government, which Quisling conceived solely as a puppet of the Reich, was to be conditional. Quisling did not even hide the fact that the German ambassador was to become the main adviser to the new "Russian" government. And the new "Russian" army was to be commanded exclusively by German officers.

Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler drew attention to this document. At the indicated time, plans for the "unification of Europe" were already being developed in the bowels of the Main Directorate of the SS. Some details of the communication between the head of the SS and the main Norwegian collaborator are still unknown. But the fact remains that in 1944 Quisling proposed to Himmler a draft of the so-called "European Pact". This document is of interest to us primarily because Quisling proposed in it the creation of a "European Congress", in which one can easily recognize the prototype of the modern European Parliament. The project seemed too "revolutionary" to both Himmler and Hitler, whom Quisling met in January 1945. However, even if the top of the Third Reich had decided to form the "European Parliament", which was supposed to be located in Vienna, this would hardly have been able to change the geopolitical situation in Europe.

Only taking into account all this information, one can understand what Quisling said during the trial and before the execution. He tried to claim that he represented British interests. In part, this was true. Between May 1927 and December 1929 Quisling was an adviser to the Norwegian embassy in Moscow. However, he succeeded not so much in defending the interests of his

countries, how many in the work for the British. For this, he even received the honorable title of Commander of the British Empire. At first glance, it may seem strange that an "English agent of influence" created a pro-Nazi party and went over to the side of Germany. However, in all his plans relating to the "unification of Europe" and the formation of the "Northern Alliance", Quisling almost always defended the position of Great Britain. An attempt to announce these geopolitical plans just led to the fact that Quisling was tried too hastily, and then executed no less hastily. The British, who effectively controlled post-war Norway, did not at all want some of their projects to be "overshadowed" by the shadow of fascism. It probably didn't look too good if the public became aware that the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO), which arose in 1949,

in fact, it was created according to the patterns proposed back in 1930 by Quisling. "European" politicians did not even begin to philosophize with the name - Quisling's "Northern Alliance" was easily transformed into the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO). When the European Parliament came into being in 1957, Quisling was completely forgotten. Again, he proposed to place the "European Congress" in Vienna, and not in Strasbourg, although the fundamental differences between the projects end there.

Now they are trying to ignore these facts, since the champions of "European politics" will have to explain why the "United Europe" and NATO, in strict adherence to Quisling's plans, had a hand in the collapse of the Soviet Union, tearing away traditionally friendly peoples from Russia. Quisling's example shows that structures like NATO and supranational formations like the "United Europe" could earlier, and can still be of any ideological character: liberal, conservative, Nazi. When changing ideological masks, their core remained unchanged, so to speak, their essence - namely, anti-Russian and anti-Russian orientation. In this regard, any talk about the "peacekeeping" of NATO seems as absurd as the talk about the exceptional "peacefulness" of the Wehrmacht and the Waffen-SS.

Chapter 7. "European Community" -

an excuse for revenge

"Everything is extremely simple: they want the European peoples to become the "white negroes" of the Third Reich," Marshal Mannerheim wrote these words in his diary at the beginning of 1939. At that time, one of the most authoritative public and political figures in Finland expressed considerable concern about the foreign policy of the National Socialists, who did not even intend to hide the expansionist aspirations of the CBOM. Literally two years will pass - and Finland will fight against the Soviet Union on the side of the Third Reich. It should be noted that this Scandinavian country was not connected with National Socialist Germany either by an ideological or military-political alliance. At first glance, it might seem that Berlin and Helsinki had completely different foreign policy goals and objectives. By and large, Finnish politicians intended to return by force the territories that had ceded to the USSR after the Winter War of 1939-1940. Finland even joined the Anti-Comintern Pact only in November 1941, when German strategists were planning to take Moscow. Such a move was the expression of a specific form of Scandinavian anti-communism. Having acquired independence in 1918, Finland formally did not plan to be subordinate to either the USSR or Germany. Nevertheless, in all the statements of Finnish politicians there was a fair amount of cunning and hypocrisy. Declaring to the public about the return of purely Finnish territories, most of the politicians were already hatching plans to create a "Greater Finland", whose territory was to extend throughout Karelia up to the Svir River. Some of them had even more impressive appetites.

In October 1941, a private conversation took place between the German ambassador Schnurre and the Finnish president Ryti. The latter frankly stated that following the results of the war, Finland was supposed to grow the Kola Peninsula. In August 1942, Ryti confirmed what had been said earlier, although he asked the German diplomats not to talk about such military installations. Ryti

he was very afraid of the reaction of the USA and the Socialist Party of Finland. Claims to the Kola Peninsula were not empty words. Already in the spring of 1942, the Finnish

politicians in conversations with German diplomats expressed concern that Norway, led by Quisling, claimed its claims to this territory. Indeed, the leader of the Norwegian Nazis in those days created a policy document - "Memorandum on the Russian Question", in which he considered the fate of the Kola Peninsula. According to him, these lands should have either gone to Norway, or transferred to "general Nordic-German use." At the same time, the Ryti government did not dare to officially declare that Finland considered the possession of all Karelia and the Kola Peninsula to be the goal of the war. Such caution was explained by the fact that although Finland was an anti-communist state, it formally remained a parliamentary republic in which a significant part of the voters gave their votes to the socialist party.

Finnish politicians were afraid to officially join the German program of "transformation of Europe" until the post-war fate of the European peoples was finally and clearly outlined. Despite the fact that in one of the numerous table conversations Hitler stated that he would like to entrust the "heroic Finnish people" with the protection of the northern flank of the Greater German Reich, such passages may not have had a concrete embodiment. However, in this case, things were different. On July 16, 1941, Hitler ordered the development of a plan that provided for the accession of Finland to the Reich. This should have happened on a federal basis. Any attempts at negotiations ended in failure: Finnish diplomats assumed that economic hegemony and German imperial-style centralism were hidden behind the colorful facade of the "New Europe". Both in December 1941 and in February 1942, German-Finnish negotiations failed to move forward, as German diplomats were unable to refute the fears of their Finnish colleagues. The same, in turn, suspected that in the "new united Europe" Finland was not destined for the role of a full partner, but the fate of a supplier of agricultural products and raw materials necessary for the industry of the Reich.

The German ambassador immediately informed Berlin that Finnish politicians were showing an increased interest in the project of "transforming Europe." However, in the same telegram, he revealed their suspicions. Ribbentrop immediately sent a reply to Helsinki marked "Top Secret". He asked me to convey that the fears were completely groundless, but with the implementation of a "united Europe" it was necessary to wait: "Now is not the right time to

engage in an in-depth discussion of the restructuring of Europe.

The Finns themselves did not doubt at all how they would like to see the "new Europe". In order to guarantee their independence from the "American" and "Asian" policy of the "great spaces", they advocated the unconditional unification of Europe. According to President Ryti, the integration process was supposed to be voluntary: "We must respect what is historically connected with our continent." The German plans for the "unification of Europe" impressed Finnish diplomats so much that already in the autumn of 1942, a draft of the future European Union was independently prepared at the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A united Europe was to have a unified foreign and military policy. However, in Berlin this document was ignored. The only concession was permission to establish the German-Finnish Society in Berlin. At its founding meeting, the German diplomat Wiper von Blücher was repeatedly asked questions concerning "what the future of Europe looks like from a German point of view." Questions once again remained unanswered.

Interest in this topic was awakened again in March 1943, when the Reich Minister of Propaganda J. Goebbels, in an interview with one of the Danish newspapers, said that the transformation of Europe should go on a voluntary basis, and the new union should in no way deprive the European peoples of their identity. In Finland, these words were taken at face value, although in reality they were just a propaganda ploy. Von Blücher urgently requested Berlin

as to whether he could interpret the words of Goebbels as the official position of the Reich. At the same time, the opinion was expressed that, accepting the theses of Goebbels as a whole, the Finns had no intention of remaining under the patronage of Germany after the end of the war. Apparently, Ribbentrop was quite angry that the Minister of Propaganda decided to intervene in matters of foreign policy. In his reply, he recommended that the interview be interpreted merely as "Goebbels' private opinion." However, the provocative interview of the Minister of Propaganda caused "an excitement of the minds" not only in Helsinki. On March 23, 1943, Finnish Ambassador Kivimäki asked the Imperial Foreign Office for official comments. He spoke openly about the need to develop a "European program" as soon as possible. The State Secretary of the Imperial Foreign Office reported in those days: "During a personal conversation, the Finnish ambassador showed me an article from a Swedish newspaper, from which it was clear that in

Germany was developing a "European program". It seems to me that this kind of information is directly related to the recent interview of the Imperial Minister Goebbels. I replied that I did not know anything about this. The official position of the Reich could hardly be the basis of an article from a Swedish newspaper. However, the ambassador was not satisfied with this explanation. He pointed to the sentiment among our allies who are intent on getting a clear plan from us of what Europe will look like after the war. Finland insists on this perhaps more than anyone else. During his trip to Slovakia, Kivimäki fully felt the lack of ideas that could serve as passwords for our allies and neutral European countries. As a result, German diplomats gave an evasive refusal, partly agreeing with their Finnish counterpart. As history shows, this program was never finally completed. Finland, like, in fact, other countries that joined the Anti-Comintern Pact, in vain expected the Third Reich to present the project of a "united Europe". Words remained words.

The last attempt to somehow influence the National Socialists was made in the second half of 1943. It was then that the next issue of the Young Europe magazine saw the light of day. On its pages, an article by the Finnish professor Ornulf Tigerstedt "The Nation State and the European Idea" was published. It spoke of a global European empire that was to emerge on the principles of respect for sovereignty and respect for the characteristics of individual European peoples: "Although the war is still going on, and we cannot even foresee when it will end, nevertheless, we are increasingly asking ourselves: what happens when the victory is won and the question of the transformation of Europe is put on the agenda? Will the German Reich, which today has assumed responsibility for the future of Europe, give a real opportunity to form a European empire, as proclaimed by the Führer? Will the creation of a European empire bring the lasting peace that a generation raised in the turmoil of war so longs for? Will the Fuhrer of Germany be able to do what many have not been able to do before - to establish European unity and solidarity on a clear material and ideological basis? However, the author of the article was actually worried not so much about the fate of his country, but about the Eastern expanses, which were supposed to go to "united Europe". "The vast expanses into which the world is now divided imply that the continent can continue its

existence only as a united organism, writes Tigerstedt. - If thirty sovereign states split and opposed to each other remain, then the history of Europe will be over. Once Hellas was united by Philip of Macedon and the construction of the Hellenic empire began in Corinth. Europe, on the other hand, faces even more powerful challenges and more promising tasks. As once united Hellas poured out its power through Persia, thereby causing the flourishing of Hellenism, so now united Europe is gaining exceptional opportunities in the East. New Hellenism is looking for an object of application of forces far beyond the expanses of Belarus and beyond the steppes of Ukraine. But none of the European nations is able to cope with this task alone. Its fulfillment requires that we all make a common effort. Where common tasks are born, there must be (whether we like it or not) common leadership and common planning. Now there are no private fronts, no private wars. There is only a common struggle and a single fire on the altar of the future. Harmonious union of nation-states within the framework of a constitutionally formalized and legalized

supranational empire, the synthesis of popular nationalism and imperial spirit, the enormous tasks in the east - all these are the goals of the generation that will determine the future of Europe.

When in 1945 the trial of the then President of Finland, Risto Heikki Ryti, took place, he strongly insisted on his own innocence. However, the above information clearly indicates that Finland did not at all intend to confine itself to returning the areas lost during the Winter War of 1939-1940. It was about the capture of vast northern territories. Actually, for the Finnish political leadership, the idea of a "united Europe", a "European Union" was just an excuse to tacitly enlist the support of Germany, which was supposed to guarantee the participation of the Scandinavian country in the division of Russian expanses. Discourses about "European solidarity" were supplemented by plans for "the application of forces far beyond the expanses of Belarus and beyond the steppes of Ukraine." Not only Germany, but also its (even conditional) allies in World War II considered the alleged European integration processes as a prologue for the reddivision of the world and the dismemberment of Russia.

Chapter 8

Did we lose the war to the French?

Question asked by Keitel during the signing of the act of surrender

In 1975, an unprecedented event happened in the cultural life of France: director Louis Malle left the country. However, none of the media expressed a single drop of regret on this occasion - on the contrary, angry accusations and insults flew at the back of the director, who was recently called a "great" and "living classic". The campaign launched in the French press was more like a bullying campaign. As a result, Louis Mal never returned to France, preferring to work in the US and Canada. But what was his fault? Why did he anger French society so much? The reason for the harassment was his film "Lacombe Lucien" (1974). More precisely, not even the film itself, but the questions posed in it: was the French Resistance really great, as it was commonly believed, and were all collaborators born villains? By the way, decades later, the same questions (but in relation to Holland) will be raised in the film "The Black Book" by another great director - Paul Verhoeven.

If we talk about France, then even the very fact of trying to ask these questions was perceived as a "slap in the face of the nation". In fairness, we note that in the USSR, too, these questions were not very much asked. Of course, the Soviet Union was well aware that the "great" French Resistance could in no way be compared with the partisan movement in Belarus or Yugoslavia, since, according to some estimates, it was inferior in scope even to Italy and Greece. Nevertheless, France was seen by Soviet politicians as the weakest link in the capitalist system, again, Charles de Gaulle did not hesitate to demonstrate his frankly skeptical attitude towards the United States and NATO, and therefore they looked at some myths of French history through their fingers. Now there is no trace left of the former French policy. France, regardless of which party government is in power, behaves like a satellite of the United States, which gives reason to once again impartially look at the events of the 60-year-old

prescription.

When the Second World War began, French society met her in the highest degree strangely: an abundance of new hats appeared. The so-called "Astrakhan fezzes" became a new bestseller. In addition, checkered fabric began to be intensively imported from England, which was used to cut women's berets. This style of headwear immediately brought to life many new hairstyles. Much was borrowed from military baggage. So, for example, the hat, the style of which was developed by Rosa Desca, was very reminiscent of an English cap.

In addition, a new accessory came into fashion almost immediately: many wore the obligatory gas mask on their side. The fear of gas attacks was so great that for several months the Parisians did not even dare to go out without it. The gas mask could be seen everywhere:

in the market, at school, in the cinema, in the theater, in a restaurant, in the subway. Some of the French women showed a lot of ingenuity in disguising gas masks. High fashion felt this trend almost immediately. So fancy bags for gas masks, made of satin, suede or leather, began to appear. Advertising and trade immediately joined this process. A new style appeared: in the form of miniature gas masks they began to produce perfume bottles and even tubes of lipstick. But cylindrical hat boxes made by Gapush were considered special chic. Parisian fashion has stepped even beyond the Atlantic. With cylindrical handbags, very reminiscent of cases for gas masks, Argentine and Brazilian fashionistas began to walk around, who were by no means threatened by the horrors of war.

The war and its first consequences (air raids and power cuts) dictated a change in the behavior of the French, especially the townspeople. Some of the eccentric Parisians began to wear khaki shirts with gilded buttons. Epaulettes began to appear on jackets. Traditional hats were replaced by stylized shakos, cocked hats and fezzes. The attributes of operetta military came into fashion. Many young women, with their summer tan still on their faces, refused to style their hair. They fell on their shoulders, resembling a kind of hood that traditionally protected from the cold. Curls and curls went out of fashion almost immediately.

Against the backdrop of the official military propaganda in the press, again strange at first glance questions sounded the loudest: how would it be better to sell all the fashion collections to the French and foreign clients? Could they have succeeded in holding the high fashion crown? In one of the French newspapers

the following flashed: "Where are those glorious old days when people from all over the globe flocked to Paris? When did the sale of one luxurious dress allow the government to buy ten tons of coal? When did the sale of a liter of spirits allow you to buy two tons of gasoline? What will happen to the 25,000 women who worked in fashion houses?"

As you can see, at first the war for the French was just an inconvenience that interfered with fashionable life. This is the only way to understand the essence of the proposal with which the famous French fashion designer Lucien Lelong addressed the authorities. He wanted to get guarantees of state support for French couturiers! He tried to explain that in a war such support was vital! That the continuation of high-end tailoring in France would allow it to maintain its sector of presence in foreign markets. He said: "Luxury and comfort are national industries. They bring millions of foreign exchange reserves, which we now so badly need. What Germany earns with mechanical engineering and the chemical industry, we earn with transparent fabrics, perfumes, flowers and ribbons."

However, when the period of the "strange war" passed and real hostilities began, the current situation seemed to many to be completely catastrophic: fashionable shops, variety shows and restaurants turned out to be closed. Now the war was perceived not just as an inconvenience, but as a ruinous moment. As a result, the defeat of France in the war was greeted with caution, but without national hysteria. In the summer of 1940, the authors of numerous newspaper and magazine publications tried to identify the reasons for the military defeat of France. Again and again they came to the problems of the moral foundations of the nation.

However, the once interrupted daily life was resumed almost immediately after the German occupation of Northern France. Already on June 18, 1940, almost all stores opened iron shutters on their windows. The major department stores in Paris: the Louvre, Galeries Lafayette, etc., have reopened. Years later, a new literary genre will appear in France - "How I did not like boches" (in Germany, its analogue will be "How I sympathized with anti-fascists"). However, the actual diary entries made by the French in the second half of 1940 showed a completely different picture. Many almost rejoiced that they could reopen their establishments. The owners of shops, stalls and restaurants were pleased with the unprecedented

the number of new visitors. And they were even more delighted that they were ready to buy everything the Germans paid

in cash. A few weeks ago, housewives in a panic swept salt, sugar and matches off the shelves, and now they are quite calmly buying woolen fabric and winter shoes. The first cafes on the Champs Elysees began to operate. The only change in the landscape was the appearance of Wehrmacht officers instead of Allied soldiers. Just a few days later, Paris again became the place of residence of numerous "foreigners". Large groups of "tourists" in field gray uniforms and CO armbands were actively photographing all Parisian sights with swastikas: the Louvre, Notre Dame Cathedral, the Eiffel Tower. The majority of the population watched in awe. However, there were those who openly welcomed the occupying troops. Gradually the fear went away. Young schoolgirls with braided pigtails sometimes mustered up the courage to smile at the conquerors. "How polite they are!" Gradually flew around Paris! "How cute they are!" The Germans became "charming occupiers". In the subway, without hesitation, they gave way to the elderly and women with children. Not only trade, but also public life revived, although this happened in a very specific way.

"The European idea is deeply rooted in France. Since Europe has become associated primarily with Germany, this idea works exclusively for us. At present, the exhibition "France is European", the opening of which was organized by our diplomatic services, attracts the attention of many visitors. We have connected the radio, press and literary observers to continuously promote the European ideology." These were the words contained in the message of the German Ambassador Otto Abetz, which was sent on June 23, 1941 to the Reich Foreign Minister Ribbentrop. One might think that the German diplomat exaggerated the degree of influence of the so-called "European idea" in France, but that would be a mistake. After French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand put forward the idea of European unification in the late 1920s, it was actively discussed both in left and right circles. Many new magazines appeared in France: New Order, New Europe, Plans, Struggle of the Young. From the titles it already follows that young French intellectuals, holding different political views, were looking for new ways to transform the "old Europe" with its disputed territories, mutual reproaches, economic crises and

political scandals. TOTO issues were actively discussed, to what extent it was possible for the emergence of pan-European patriotism, supra-class socialism, and whether these phenomena could become the basis for the unification of all Western European peoples.

It should be noted that these discussions did not stop even during the Second World War. In no other European country under German control has so much been written about the "European idea" as in France! It seemed that the "European idea" was used in order to overcome long-standing German-French contradictions, which in turn was supposed to restore France to its former greatness. No sooner had the so-called "Vichy government" been formed than its youngest representatives turned to the German ambassador Abetz. They presented the German diplomat with a plan for the reorganization of France, which was not only supposed to meet the "standards" of the "axis" countries, but also had to integrate its economy into a common (read: German) economic space. The policy statement did not at all resemble the request of the occupied country - the representatives of the "Vichy government" intended "through the defeat of France to gain the victory of Europe." The memorandum stated: "We are forced to take an active position, as our country is in distress. Military defeat, growing unemployment, the specters of hunger disorientated the public. Being under the pernicious influence of old prejudices, false propaganda that feeds on facts alien to the life of the common people, instead of looking to the future, our country turns back to the bygone past, content with voices heard from abroad. We offer our fellow countrymen an extremely useful and exciting field of activity that is capable of satisfying the vital interests of the country, revolutionary

instincts and exacting national consciousness.

The proposed transformation of France included seven important components: 1) the adoption of a new political constitution; 2) the transformation of the French economy; 3) its integration into the European economy; 4) adoption of a program of public works in the field of construction; 5) the creation of a socialist movement; 6) reorientation of the French colonies in accordance with the "European program"; 7) new guidelines in the foreign policy of France. Of all this list, we should be primarily interested in the question of the "new" foreign policy. On this issue, the document stated the following: "The French government does not want to abuse

given him the confidence, and therefore will not allow to recreate the past system of alliances, focused on maintaining the so-called balance in Europe.

In addition, France should not be a weak point, but a zone through which non-European political ideas would seep. France is forever connected with the fate of the continent, it emphasizes solidarity, which in the future should unite our country with all the peoples of Europe. Based on this, we believe that France should become the defensive frontier of Europe, which is predetermined by our sea coast, and therefore can become a European bastion in the Atlantic. France will be able to cope with this task if the same harmonious distribution of responsibilities is applied in this area as in the areas of the economy. France must protect Europe primarily through the strength of her fleet and colonial troops.

By and large, the "European idea" in France during the 1940s underwent several changes. At first, it was clearly Anglophobic in nature. This was not surprising, given the details of the meeting between Marshal Pétain and Hitler, which took place on October 24, 1940 in the town of Montoir-sur-le-Loire. During these negotiations, Hitler told the marshal, who became the head of France: "Someone has to pay for the lost war. It will be either France or England. If England covers the expenses, France will take her rightful place in Europe and can fully maintain her position as a colonial power. At the turn of 1940-1941, it was England that was seen as the main enemy of the French and Europe as a whole. Activists who rallied around the New Europe magazine actively developed this topic. In the course was the story of Joan of Arc, who died at the stake, the treacherous flight of the British troops from Dunkirk, attacks on the French fleet near Mers-el-Kebir and much more.

One of the consistent supporters > Franco-German rapprochement and folding on the basis of this alliance "New Europe" was the historian and government secretary Jacques Benoît Mechain. He dreamed not just of a "New Europe", but of some kind of imperial hierarchy based on "a great brotherhood of revolutionary parties." He insisted that Rome and Berlin recognize France as an equal partner in the Axis, the third most important fascist power in Europe. It may seem strange to domestic readers that France was presented precisely as a "fascist power", but this was not an exaggeration. Freedom-loving, democratic and leftist

oriented France (which is the historical image many of us are accustomed to) was nothing more than a myth. Historian Zeev Shternkhel in his works (unfortunately, still not translated into Russian) has repeatedly raised the question of the "French roots of fascism." Indeed, the formation of fascist ideology (or, as Sternhel writes, pro-fascist) in France began many decades earlier than in Italy and Germany. The starting point can be considered Maurice Barres, who first began to cross between radical nationalism and syndicalist ideas. Again, do not forget that in 1934 power in France almost passed to the radical nationalists, when they brought more than 40 thousand people to the streets of Paris (the "Popular Front" could not boast of such massive actions). And a year later, De la Roca's Fire Crosses numbered several hundred thousand people, being in fact the largest political organization in France (not counting other ultra-right and fascist organizations).

If we talk about Benoit-Méchain, then he repeatedly called on the Third Reich "to create a united Europe, which will become ... the best military weapon." Based on this thesis, he, together with Jacques Gerard (another member of the "Vichy government"), developed a draft "Transitional Treaty", which, according to its creators, was supposed to replace the armistice agreement concluded between Germany and France in 1940. A special secret protocol was to be attached to the "Transitional Treaty", the text of which is of particular interest. The three countries (Germany, Italy and France) were to agree on the following: France was to continue the "national revolution", which would lead to the emergence of "based on popular, authoritarian and socialist will" political movement; in foreign policy, France joined in all the actions carried out by the governments of Germany and Italy; in the military field, France was theoretically ready to start hostilities against Great Britain ("as soon as the country's military potential was restored"). In fact, this document suggested the creation of a tripartite pact, and France was supposed to act as an independent power, and by no means as a country occupied by Germany.

The draft of this document was handed over to the German Imperial Government on July 14, 1941. The reaction of Berlin discouraged the French in many ways. In July, Ernst Achenbach notified the French government that Berlin was annoyed by the proposals made in the project.

"tripartite pact". On July 23, 1941, Ribbentrop instructed Ambassador Abetz to convey to Jacques Benoît Méchain that "the proposals made were an unacceptable attempt to cancel the state of truce, which could lead to tension between Germany and France." Such an answer greatly disappointed many members of the "Vichy government". Jacques Benoist-Méchain himself did not give up hopes to form a "united Europe without the vanquished", suggesting that a new impetus to European integration should have been given by Germany's attack on the USSR. In November 1942, he wrote in one of his letters: "I believed that Hitler would unite all the continental countries in order to launch an assault on the Stalinist empire. As a model, I saw Alexander the Great, who united all the Hellenic cities in order to begin the seizure of the Persian kingdom. Wasn't the fight against Bolshevism the general principle that could give us the feeling of a single continent? This was a message that would allow us to get rid of small-town patriotism, freeing ourselves from long-standing contradictions and traditional rivalry between countries in Europe. Moreover, it was the lever that was supposed to allow nationalism, tormented by internal conflicts, to expand and turn into European supernaturalism.

Aggression against the USSR and overcoming narrow ethnic nationalism were the main incentives that forced tens of thousands of Frenchmen to fight on the side of Germany. The first recruiting centers appeared in France in July 1941, everyone was invited to take part in the "war against the Soviets." The general sympathy for the USSR and the Russians turned out to be nothing more than a myth. In the very first two weeks of the work of the points, about ten thousand Frenchmen signed up for the "Eastern campaign" by volunteers! And when in 1943 the registration in the SS unit began, in a matter of days, one and a half thousand people appeared who wanted to try on the uniform of the elite units. In Berlin, they cleverly used the idea of a "New Europe" and the anti-Bolshevik sentiment that prevailed in France. But the French politicians themselves saw that many of the ideas remained just ideas. After the very possibility of signing an "interim treaty" and then a "tripartite pact" was decisively rejected in the Reich, the decrepit Marshal Pétain tried to appeal to the German sense of responsibility, wishing that the "New Europe", at least gradually, would become a reality. He expected that the solution to this problem would occur during a meeting with Reichsmarschall Göring, but this never happened. Once in a conversation, Pétain remarked: "France is not

sees nothing better than integration into the New Europe. But what needs to be done to make this happen? As we walk in the dark with our hands tied. To begin with, we would like to understand what kind of place is prepared for us in the New Europe? The ideas of infusing France into the "New Europe" were no less actively promoted by representatives of collaborationist parties: the National People's Association, the Party of the French People, the Francists, the Movement of Social Revolutionaries. Jacques Doriot, leader of the French People's Party, like Benoit-

Mechain, considered aggression against the USSR as a springboard for the formation of a "supernational European consciousness".

The problem of French supporters of an alliance with Germany invariably leads to the problem of active opponents of this idea. The myth of the "great French resistance" is a myth squared. First, the active guerrilla struggle at its peak involved approximately 20 thousand people (with the support of the British, who supplied them with weapons). At the same time, there were more than a million people in the Legion of French Fighters and Volunteers of the National Revolution, which opposed the activities of the maquis. Secondly, the national composition of the Maquis detachments allows us to speak of the "French Resistance" only from the point of view of the territory on which military actions were undertaken. Actually, the French began to actively get into partisan detachments only after the landing in Normandy took place, that is, when the question of the fate of France was actually resolved. Until that moment, the backbone of the detachments were fighters of the international brigades, who at one time fought in Spain, and then went to the territory of France, escaped prisoners of war, Jews hiding from persecution, representatives of the Armenian diaspora. It seems that until 1943, inclusive, if not without exception all the French, then a significant part of them were in favor of an alliance with Germany, believing the Maqui partisans to be "bandits" who only provoked violence.

The situation began to change before our eyes in 1944. Until recently, the French inhabitants, satisfied with their lives and the conditions of occupation, immediately turned into ultra-patriots, who, almost since 1940, had been hatching plans to destroy the German hegemony. Usually such an "epiphany" was accompanied by the disgusting scenes themselves. According to rough estimates, in the period from 1944 to 1945, about one hundred thousand people were killed without trial or investigation, suspected of

collaborationism. The scope of reprisals and lynching was quite comparable to the wave of German terror that began in France in 1942. It should be noted that in order to become a victim of lynching in 1944-1945, it was not at all necessary to be a real accomplice of the German occupiers. Quite often, scores were settled on the sly with uncomfortable witnesses, annoying mistresses and lovers, creditors, etc. If we take into account that after the end of the war, 50 thousand collaborators were sentenced to various prison terms and another 10 thousand were executed, then the question arises: Who was executed in the end more - French partisans or French collaborators? Of course, the number of the latter was much higher.

The scientific literature describes in sufficient detail one of the mechanisms of psychological defense - the "replacement effect". In relation to history, we can say that by the beginning of 1945, almost all the French decided to reconsider their past. They saw themselves not at all as a defeated people who, together with the victor, were trying to create a "New Europe", but as victors who were only looking for a reason to take revenge on the Germans. It was the French zone of occupation that stood out against the general background (Soviet, American and English) with an incredible number of acts of violence against the civilian population. Once one of the American officers remarked on this occasion: "They were useless warriors, which made them even more nervous and vindictive." Anti-German sentiments were specially cultivated in the French army. When the French entered southwestern Germany, their presence resulted in innumerable looting and violence. To restore discipline in the army, which at some point began to look more like a gang of marauders, the French command had to resort to the most stringent measures. But the reputation of the French troops deteriorated worse than ever. Even the Americans considered them "bad warriors, able to prove themselves only in drinking and hunting for Germans." It was in the French zone of occupation that the hostage system was officially introduced (the execution of civilians in the event of an attack on the French military). This order was given by General Leclerc, which shocked all the allies.

The cruelty and repression of the French in a short time created a distance between ordinary Germans and the liberators. As a result, the German population withdrew into itself at the very moment when it was open to new influences. Disappointment befell even the German anti-fascists. The first after the end of the war anti-fascist

a demonstration organized on May 20, 1945 in Cologne by former prisoners of the concentration camps was dispersed by the military police. Some of the French officers even offered to use firearms. The level of violence against the German civilians in the French zone of occupation was so great that one of the American senators even planned to hold special hearings on this issue. However, he managed to "dissuade" him from this venture in time. In any case, the Swiss newspaper Berner Tagesblatt wrote on May 30, 1945: "The oppression perpetrated by the French seems worse than the atrocities of the Nazis."

If we talk about the size of the French occupation administration, then the process of its growth literally resembled a flood. By the fall of 1945, at least 300,000 Frenchmen had found "work" in Germany. If we make some comparison, we will find that by 1946, for every 10,000 Germans, there were 118 French working for the occupation authorities. At the same time, this figure for the British was 66 people. France did not consider it necessary to feed her compatriots, preferring that Germany did it. Such an installation was the cause of numerous robberies that took place in the south-west of Germany. The French did not come here to save the world from Nazism, but to "eat". As a result, all these atrocities led to the fact that in the French occupation zone, death from malnutrition among the civilian population risked turning into an "epidemic". Hunger among civilians, contrary to the idle conjectures of modern publicists, was the fate of not the Soviet, but the French occupation POLICY.

It would seem that one could turn a blind eye to all these facts, which, in fact, was done at one time by Soviet politicians. However, the first wake-up call came in 1994, when the Russian delegation was not invited to the celebrations dedicated to the opening of the Second Front. Then the Western community openly hinted that, they say, France was the victorious country, and Russia "as it were, not very much." For this reason alone, it makes sense (before it's too late) to ask a whole series of questions:

- why for one Frenchman who went to the partisans, there were several of his compatriots who voluntarily enlisted in the Wehrmacht and the Waffen-SS?
- Why were there many thousands of Frenchmen who were in Soviet captivity when they fought on the side of Hitler for a hundred pilots from the Normandie-Niemen squadron?
- why did the radical French fascist Georges Valois end his days in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp, and the French communist Jacques Doriot volunteered for the Eastern Front to fight against the USSR?
- why did the Red Army soldiers have to wage the last battles in Berlin at the Reich Chancellery not against fanatical Germans, but against French SS men?
- Why did the Europeans, who did not have a long historical memory, begin to attribute the arbitrariness perpetrated by the French occupation authorities in Germany to parts of the Red Army?
- why did Francois Mitterrand, a leader of the Vichy administration, become a respected politician after the end of the war, while the great French writer Louis-Ferdinand Celine was subjected to "public disgrace"?

Why was the fashion designer Lucien Lelong, who collaborated with the occupiers, proclaimed a figure in the "cultural resistance" ("He saved French fashion"), while the French novelist and journalist Robert Brasillac was shot as an accomplice of the occupiers?

And the two most important questions:

- Can France be considered the winner of fascism, if it was she who gave birth to the fascist ideology as such (once again I recommend reading the work of Zeev Sternhell)?

- can France be considered the winner of fascism, if it was her predatory policy, carried out under the guise of the Versailles Peace Treaty, on the one hand, that provoked the emergence of Italian fascism and German national socialism, and on the other hand, laid the foundation for a global geopolitical conflict, which ultimately spilled over into World War II?

Chapter 9. "European Union" as a slogan

collaborators

Belgium was one of the first Western European countries to fall victim to German aggression in 1940. It was not saved either by the "timely" proclaimed neutrality, or by the Western allies. However, most of the Belgian politicians viewed the military defeat and occupation not as a tragedy at all, but as an opportunity to transform Europe and the beginning of the formation of a "European Union". In the camp of collaborators were not only representatives of fascist and nationalist organizations, but also numerous parliamentary politicians, publicists and trade unionists. With amazing tenacity, they offered the occupying authorities and the Third Reich programs aimed at the transformation and unification of Europe. These projects did not cause much enthusiasm among the Germans, if only because a significant part of them were of a federalist nature. But nevertheless, the fact remains: literally all Belgian collaborators were obsessed with the idea of the "European Union".

The beginning of this process was laid by Henry (Henrik) de Man¹, a well-known Belgian politician who, on the eve of World War II, was a member of several government cabinets. Henry de Man was not just one of the theorists of European socialism, but the leader of the Socialist Party of Belgium. In the 1930s he developed the idea that the Belgian workers, middle class and peasants were to form a united front against plutocratic capital. Strange as it may seem, but Henry de Man sympathized with the Third Reich, naively believing that German National Socialism was able to destroy the class barriers of society. He never denied the need to combine a social idea with a national component, although he did not belong to any of the national groupings of Belgium (Flemish - oriented towards Germany, Walloon - oriented towards France).

No sooner had the German troops occupied Belgium than Henry de Man prepared a special manifesto. This document became public on June 28, 1940. The manifesto clearly showed a tendency towards the formation of a "European Union" and

reconciliation with the invaders. De Man wrote: "Despite the defeat in the war, despite our suffering and disappointment, the way has been paved for two things: for European concord and social justice. It was hardly possible to count on a peaceful situation in the conditions of the rivalry of imperial aspirations and the alliance of free sovereign nations. Genuine peace could come only in a militarily united Europe, in which all economic frontiers were immediately eliminated... Now is the time to prepare to become the pioneers of a national renaissance that will gather all the truly living forces of the nation; unite youth and old fighters in a single union.

Immediately after the publication of his manifesto, Henry de Man made an attempt to found the National Union of Flanders, which he saw as a unifying party for all German-speaking Belgians. However, this idea seemed to the German occupation authorities highly doubtful, and therefore the creation of a new organization was prohibited. And the Belgian socialist himself seemed to the Germans a highly "suspicious" person. Despite the fact that de Man proclaimed "the German victory as a prerequisite for the unifying transformation of Europe" on almost every corner, in the summer of 1941 he was forbidden to make any public statements. Do not forget that at that time

European integration projects were considered by the Third Reich as an abstract possibility, but not as an urgent political task.

It is very significant that the ideas of the "European Union" and "European integration" were developed precisely by the collaborators. They were so obsessed with them that they often preferred to ignore the existing prohibitions. This is the only way to explain the fact that in 1942 Henry de Man published in Brussels a pamphlet called "World Awareness", in which he offered the reader his own vision of a "European Community" pursuing a common foreign policy, having common troops, having no internal customs and trade barriers. De Man wrote in his pamphlet: "It does not matter whether the new entity is called a federation, a union, a league, an association, an empire, the United States of Europe, a kingdom, or in any other way. For ease of reference, I will refer to it as the European Community. More importantly, this association should have a certain competence, similar to the one that federal states and federations of states receive. In other words, the future union will not have any rights that would not have been provided

founding states, but will have its own sovereignty, exceeding the sovereign rights of individual states.

At the same time, the Belgian collaborator insisted on the development of the ideas of "European socialism", which should have nothing to do with Marxism. He saw a "European Community" without oppression and exploitation: "Any manifestation of state imperialism, when something like colonial subjugation of the weak by the strong is undertaken in Europe, carries the germ of a future global conflict." Assuming that a "united Europe" should be a supranational formation, Henry de Man allowed himself to give advice to the German occupation authorities: "The victors must forget about their victory - this is the only way for us to forget about our defeat." Such a prospect did not suit either the German occupation authorities or the diplomats of the Third Reich. That is why, not having time to go out of print in the summer of 1942, the pamphlet written by de Man was banned. Its circulation was withdrawn from sale. Under these conditions, de Man preferred to move to France, where he developed the ideas of the "European Union" already in collaboration with French collaborators.

However, time passed, and the tactics of the Third Reich changed. If at first it was planned to simply include the territories of occupied Belgium into the "Great German Reich", then over time, at the initiative of the SS leadership, which was in dire need of European volunteers to replenish parts of the Waffen-SS, more sophisticated tactics began to be used. The Flamings, that is, the supporters of an independent Flanders, did not want to be either part of Belgium or part of a unified Reich. Heinrich Himmler preferred to give evasive answers to direct questions. In February 1944, he spoke with the leader of the Flemish National Union, Hendrik Elias, to whom he promised that Flanders could count on autonomy as part of the "Great German Union", which, after the end of the war, was supposedly to replace the "Great German Reich". Himmler promised something similar to the leader of the fascist Rexist movement, Leon Degrel.

The leader of Belgian Rexism, who is still one of the most infamous collaborators, made, like de Man, an attempt to give birth to his own project of the "European Union". On October 20, 1940, Degrel published the European Memorandum. This document is interesting if only because it clearly states that European integration should have been purely national socialist

program. For example, the memorandum stated: "National Socialist Germany, whether she wishes it or not, is responsible for the whole of Europe. Either it will provide the basis for a stable peace, and not only material, but also moral, or Europe will be engulfed in anarchy ... National Socialist Germany must in the future provide order for the unification of Europe. This order cannot be ensured unless the German army maintains it throughout Europe. The military units of the Third Reich may be smaller and located on only a few bases. They must be present in all

Europe, at least in the first years of peaceful existence. If Germany withdraws from the old parliamentary countries infected with democratic propaganda, then revolution and anarchy will inevitably come ... Despite the fact that National Socialism is not an ideological export, it is inevitable that it will coordinate and ensure the harmonious coexistence of the countries of the New Europe. Ideas of this kind were based on the personal ideas of Degrel, who bowed before Hitler. As eyewitnesses noted, he was convinced that Hitler would soon "abandon the spirit of German nationalism and embrace the idea of a Greater Europe, which would mark the transition to a Europe of united Fatherlands, but not to a Europe in which one state would dominate over others."

In order to implement his ideas, Degrel was ready to make significant concessions. For example, in 1941, in conversations with German politicians, he portrayed the Walloon volunteers who went to serve in the Wehrmacht as "French-speaking Germans." Even after the end of the Second World War, the leader of the banned Rexists continued to insist on his own: "From the very beginning of the war, Europe has been the object of numerous experiences for us. It was clear that the time of small, selfish states was a thing of the past. A new formula for Europe had to be found... The real problem was to convince Germany not to use her military victory to subjugate the remnants of Europe. We admired the Germans, but did not want to become them: we were the children of our own people, and Europe was an association of peoples, a community of nations. We did everything possible to create a united Europe out of the harmonious combination of these peoples." However, in practice, "united Europe" has become a realm of terror and horror.

Numerous testimonies have been preserved in which Leon Degrel was characterized as a "braggart" and an "extremely vain person."

Exorbitant ambition and global plans confused many of the leaders of the Rexist movement. When in January 1943 Degrelle returned from the Eastern Front to Belgium, he made two speeches in which he openly declared the need for Belgium to grow into the "new Europe". During a speech at the Brussels Sports Palace, which took place on January 18, 1943, he said: "We are ready to take our place in the Greater German community tomorrow." And further: "The time of meaningless particularism is finally a thing of the past." Of course, statements of this kind were received very favorably in the Third Reich (most of all they pleased Heinrich Himmler). However, some of the Belgian collaborators saw in these words signs of abandonment of the original idea of the "National Socialist European Union". On January 25, 1943, one of the prominent rexists, Pierre de Ligne, sent a letter to Degrelle, in which he outlined his own vision of the "European revolution of the future": "I passionately wish that during this revolution our country will take its rightful place in Europe, but as an autonomous states". Raymond de Becker, editor-in-chief of one of the collaborationist magazines published in Belgium, said something similar. He was ready to support the idea of a "European Union" only if the integration of the French "as a nation would be carried out on the basis of an already existing state."

At the same time, the most original plans for "European integration" among the Belgian collaborators were still not developed by Degrel, but by his "right hand", the leader of the Rexist parliamentary faction, Pierre De. He began to study in detail the problem of the practical implementation of the "European integration" plan. Like Degrel, Pierre Deux believed that the "European Union" should be exclusively a product of National Socialism. In 1942, he published a book in Brussels with a very characteristic title - "Europe for Europeans". Despite the fact that this work contained many ideas that could be perceived in the Third Reich as openly "heretical", "Europe for Europeans" was not banned. Pierre Det believed that the "League of Nations" was a good idea implemented by bad means. Moreover, he dared to give a positive assessment of Briand's project when, in the early 1930s, he proposed to begin the formation of a "common European space." Pierre De, as the intellectual leader of the Walloon fascists, proposed the creation of a "European Federation", the formation of which would take into account all the features of the European peoples. Plans outlined by this

collaborator, were brought to life, but at a different time and, it would seem, by completely different people.

So what did Pierre Det write in 1942? "The initiative that brought the League of Nations to life was acceptable to us. It was the first attempt, the first effort to organically unite the states. If this idea had been put into practice, then we would have been saved. The underlying principle was very good. It was necessary to create a joint-stock company "Europe". And she, like every joint-stock company, needed a general director. This post could be filled by a Frenchman or an Englishman. But they so perverted the original idea that they finally discredited themselves. As a result, the only contender for the director's chair was a German. He was able to demonstrate that he alone had the strength and determination to reorganize the continent. And this fact cannot be doubted.

Years will pass, and already the new European Union, with its center in Belgium (after all, the dream of the Rexists about Brussels as one of the centers of a united Europe has come true) and on German funds, will dictate its will to the "united Europe". Representatives of the new European Union tried diligently to forget who exactly brought the idea of a "united Europe" into the plane of practical solutions. Moreover, it is somehow not customary to remember the ancestors from the environment of collaborators, German Nazis and Italian fascists. Some of them were executed as accomplices of the German occupiers, some tried to change their ideological color as quickly as possible, resolutely abandoning their political past. But one can hardly doubt that, by pouring "new wine into old wineskins", the creators of the new European Union could not fundamentally change its essence: behind the tinsel of beautiful phrases about "sovereignty", "human rights", "social justice", more and more often the ominous reflections of the "old European Union" flash more often. And just as the collaborators of the past were mistaken, believing that the Third Reich would allegedly give Europe peace and harmony, so the current supporters of European integration ideas do not want to see that they risk losing not only sovereignty, but

The aggression of the Third Reich against the neutral Holland is still one of the strangest stories in the history of the Second World War. Having started the invasion on May 10, 1940, the German troops actually marched through the whole country. Already on May 14, the Dutch command, seeing the senselessness of the military

resistance, ordered a ceasefire, after which the surrender was signed. Many of the historians noted that the capture of Holland was more reminiscent of the Anschluss of Austria than the fighting against any of the countries of Western Europe. The Dutch themselves considered the Germans not just as European neighbors, but as some kind of ethnic brothers. This attitude became a prerequisite for the formation of a broad collaborationist movement in the Netherlands. More than 50 thousand Dutchmen ended up in the German military formations, 10 thousand of them died on the Eastern Front. At the same time, the losses among the Dutch fighting against Germany were much more modest.

The basis for Dutch collaborationism was the National Socialist Movement of the Netherlands, created in 1931, headed by Anton Mussert. When the country was seized, Mussert's movement numbered about 100 thousand people. Like most European collaborators, the Dutch National Socialists were active advocates of the idea of forming a "European Union". In fairness, we note that in Germany such plans have always been treated with a fair amount of skepticism. The "European Union" was a propaganda ploy for the Third Reich, but by no means a geopolitical project that had to be implemented immediately after the cessation of hostilities. Although German diplomats and representatives of the occupying authorities preferred to remain silent about this. The unfulfilled hopes of the Dutch collaborators greatly facilitated the management of the occupied territories.

In fact, immediately after the capture of Holland by German troops, Anton Mussert began to develop his own project, which involved the implementation of European integration. As a result, on August 27, 1940, the leader of the Dutch National Socialists presented to Hitler

a memorandum in which he proposed the formation of an "Union of German Peoples". The basis of this federation was to be made up of Germans, Dutch, Swedes, Norwegians, Danes and Swiss. The proposed union was to cover the territory of all Western and Northern Europe. It was assumed that the "Union of German Peoples" would be supplemented by a federation of southeastern peoples, which in turn would be controlled by fascist Italy. In his project, Mussert refrained from proposals of a state-legal and diplomatic nature, but emphasized that the future "European Union" should have a common armed forces and a common

economy.

If you carefully study this document, you can find that behind the formal words about "respect for the rights of European peoples" there was a desire to increase the territory of Holland at the expense of neighboring countries. For example, Mussert declared his intention to "annex" Flanders, Brabant and Limburg to the Netherlands. In addition, the Dutch National Socialists wanted to increase their country's colonial holdings. In addition to the already existing Dutch East Indies, it was planned to "master" South Africa and the Congo. Tellingly, the collaborators masked their appetites with "good intentions." Mussert himself, in his memorandum, very pathetically stated that "he is the son of his people, who wants only the best for his people and sees the guarantee of a happy future in the implementation of the ideas outlined."

The idea of creating a "Union of German Peoples" as a basis for the implementation of the proposed European integration seemed to Anton Mussert so successful that for some time he was literally obsessed with it. His perception of the "united continent" in 1940, he outlined in the pamphlet "The Tasks of the Netherlands in the New Europe". In the pages of this little book, Mussert dreamed of "the unification of 120 million people, the union of which will be impeccable from a military point of view, which will become the basis of exceptional economic prosperity." Despite the fact that Holland was included in the Third Reich as the "Reichskommissariat of the Netherlands", Mussert had no doubt that the granting of autonomy was only a matter of time. He made a similar judgment in 1942 in Young Europe: "In the European Union, the Dutch people will retain their culture, their customs and traditions, their language and the right to lead their own lives."

It is difficult to say how much Mussert believed in what he said. In any case, addressing thousands of supporters of the National Socialist Movement of the Netherlands in 1942, he called for support for the Third Reich, since it allegedly created the basis of "cooperation, mutual respect and understanding of the European peoples." It is difficult to say what was more in these words - cynical stupidity or short-sighted naivety. In the Third Reich, Mussert's activities were perceived with irritation, believing his party was not at all National Socialist, but "bourgeois-fascist." None of the Nazi politicians intended to consider a plan to give Holland some kind of autonomy. Mussert either did not want to believe it, or pretended not to believe it. In any case, on every corner he declared that "the continent must unite,

becoming a common house in which each of the peoples will take their safe place. I would like to draw attention to the fact that the phraseology used by modern supporters of the European Union has not actually changed over the past decades.

What was happening in the Third Reich while Mussert was actively promoting among his compatriots the idea of a "European Union", in which Holland was supposedly supposed to receive autonomy? The Reichsfuehrer SS regarded the Dutch as merely human material, on the one hand replenishing the ranks of the Waffen-SS units, and on the other hand contributing to the fulfillment of demographic tasks. At the same time, the Imperial Commissioner Seyss-Inquart, who ruled the occupied Holland, received from Hitler the "go-ahead" for the Dutch territories to gradually "integrate" into the Reich. It looked like Mussert simply did not want to notice the obvious. Moreover, on December 10, 1942, he submitted his next geopolitical project to Hitler for consideration! This time it was about the "European Federation". In response, Hitler openly declared that Holland and Belgium

never get autonomy, but become part of a unified Reich, "which will be much stronger than any federation."

However, Mussert heard only what he wanted to hear, namely the words about the "policy of friendship." He was turned away by both supporters of autonomy and radicals from his own party. But even this did not bother Mussert. On June 22, 1943, he loudly declared: "Everything is for German cooperation, nothing is for pan-Germanism!" The supporters of the "European Union" from among the Dutch collaborators, who were present in the hall, literally went into joyful shouts and applause. Despite everything, Mussert continued to hope for autonomy and "equal rights". The answer from Berlin was not long in coming. On July 8, 1943, Mussert was called "on the carpet" to the Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler. In the office of the chief of the "black order", the Dutchman was given a very unequivocal message that "particularistic ideas will be burned out by fire." It would seem that the story about the Dutch collaborators and their hopes for autonomy within the framework of the "European Union" could be put to rest... But no.

In the fall of 1943, Anton Mussert, who did not want to part with geopolitical illusions, sent another memorandum to Hitler. This document was more like some kind of spell of a person who diligently did not want to perceive the realities of the real

life: "I believe that Germany, going from victory to victory, will use its power to unite Europe, and not to enslave the peoples, infringing on their sovereign rights." After such statements in the Third Reich, they decided to move from words to deeds. The dull collaborator was taken under house arrest. At the end of the war, he was offered to volunteer for the Wehrmacht, which he took advantage of. On May 7, he was taken prisoner in The Hague, and a year later he was shot.

Anton Mussert made his last attempt to defend his naive ideas on December 1, 1944, when it was clear to everyone that the Third Reich had lost the war. It was then that Mussert sent Hitler another (this time the last in his life) memorandum in his characteristic manner. The document had the characteristic title "The Core of Europe. Military-economic union of European nations. In particular, it said: "The goal of forming the core of Europe is the cooperation of European nations in the military and economic spheres. This cooperation can be established only when each of the nations realizes that unification is a vital necessity for each of the European peoples. And further: "An alliance cannot be imposed on the peoples by Berlin, but, on the contrary, the peoples themselves must come forward with this initiative to Berlin. The Führer must be asked to form the core of Europe, an alliance in which the German people will take their most worthy place. Since the Netherlands, without a doubt, will make the biggest sacrifice on the altar of the union being built, because transatlantic interests will have to be abandoned, it would be quite logical that the initiative to create the union came from the Dutch. The union formation ceremony can be held in one of the palaces of The Hague."

The ideas of the collaborators were heard, although after most of them were either hanged or shot. Do not forget about the palaces of The Hague. Based in this Dutch city, the international tribunal persistently creates the appearance of justice. Although most of the European politicians who are so advocating for the "Magnitsky list" do not want to see that the head of a sovereign state, Slobodan Milosevic, died in The Hague at one time under strange circumstances. However, European politicians are not the first to resort to the practice of double standards. They learned this from the first bearers of the idea of a "European Union" - European collaborators, or, more simply, accomplices of the occupying authorities. It was they who conjured the Third Reich as "the guarantor of mutual respect and understanding of the European peoples"; it was they who nurtured the ideas of a united

Europe. Is it any wonder that the "European Union", created according to the models of the National Socialists and Fascists, despite its declared liberality, more and more often demonstrates to the public a penchant for totalitarian methods of solving problems. As life shows, history does not teach many of those who intend to make politics. Supporters of European integration do not want

see the realities of life; they raise a certain speculative Euro-image on the flag, which has nothing to do with reality. The example of Dutch (in fact, as well as all European) collaborationism shows us a rare mixture of stupidity and naivety, for which then you have to pay not only for people who allowed themselves these negative qualities, but also for entire nations.

French collaborationism, which actually became a household name, was by no means limited to representatives of the Vichy government. This concept also extended to a certain number of political parties and groups that insisted on active cooperation with the occupation authorities. Despite certain differences in their ideological attitudes, all these organizations were united in their desire to include France in the body of the "New United Europe". It was a fixed idea. She was obsessed with French nationalists, and French fascists, and French national syndicalists. They were not at all embarrassed that they called for cooperation with a country that until some time ago was considered the most terrible and most sworn enemy of France. Actually, this was the essence of French collaborationism. In particular, the position of the French fascists was indicative, considering themselves the last bearers of a supranational ideology - so supranational that they were ready to ally with some of the communists. Distancing themselves from bourgeois nationalists and right-wing politicians admiring French statehood, they considered the military defeat of their country not too high a price if it eventually led to the triumph of universal European fascism. Again, many of the French fascists, despite numerous contradictions, expressed rare unity that the Vichy government was too slow to "establish cooperation with Berlin." The ideas of a united Europe were preached in the National Popular Unity, the Party of the French People, the Francist Party, and the Social Revolutionary Movement for the National Revolution. These organizations have tried

play a role not only in the internal life of France, but also in foreign policy.

Let us immediately make a reservation that most of the ideological ideas of the French collaborators turned out to be an illusion. They were under the delusion that Berlin was eager to see a French government representing the interests of most political groups. German diplomats received secret orders from Germany to prevent by any means the formation of a united political front on French territory. Hitler and Ribbentrop preferred that France be torn apart by internal political conflicts, and all the collaborator groups would be in constant struggle with each other. On November 19, 1942, the German ambassador Otto Abetz hurriedly telegraphed to Berlin, hurrying to inform that he managed to persuade the leader of the "Party of the French People" Jacques Doriot (by the way, once an active communist) to refuse political cooperation with other French fascists. The telegram, in particular, reported: "If we had to agree to the creation of a single political bloc, nevertheless, we must avoid admitting that the political initiative is in the hands of the influential Doriot group, since his formal victory could lead to the restoration of France, its unification and transformation in the national socialist spirit.

The above quotation shows with the utmost clarity that German politicians allowed the emergence of groups ideologically related to National Socialism in the occupied territories only if such a development of events did not threaten the geopolitical dictates of Berlin. However, the French collaborators naively believed that within the framework of the "New United Europe" their country would be able to maintain its sovereignty, which was in no way included in the plans of the Third Reich. Nevertheless, for the time being, the French preferred to be kept in the dark. Only this can explain the fact that Jacques Doriot on May 25, 1941, in his speech declared the integrity of France and the framework of Hitler-led Europe: "After 1919, Europe could not have 20 years of peace, since Germany was treated cruelly and unfairly. In 1941 Europe might have met the same fate if France had been insulted and enslaved."

When Germany attacked the USSR, the French fascists, in fact, like all other collaborators, saw in this

aggression the possibility of creating a united Europe. Jacques Doriot welcomed the idea of using volunteers from among the French, Dutch, Welsh, Flemings, Scandinavians and many others on the Eastern Front. It was these warriors from the units of the Wehrmacht and the Waffen-SS that he considered the representatives of the "new united Europe, which could erase the old continental borders." However, neither Doriot, with his "proletarian fascism" and the idea of "brotherly Europe united by trench aristocracy", nor the politicians from Vichy were allowed to begin in practice the unification of Europe. Propaganda pathos was not supposed to move into the plane of practical solutions.

The secretary of the "Party of the French People" Victor Barthelemy, unlike Doriot, was skeptical about the idea of uniting Europe under the patronage of Germany. In the autumn of 1944, Barthelemy issued a special appeal in which he listed all the reasons why the Europeans finally turned away from the German National Socialists. In particular, the rejection of the slogan "no vanquished, no winners" was mentioned, as well as the conscious pursuit of a repressive reactionary course instead of engaging in the implementation of "revolutionary politics". However, in the same 1944, a significant part of the activists of the "Party of the French People" chose to hide in Germany. These were those who continued to believe in the myth of a "united Europe" and therefore naively believed that it was still possible to return victoriously to France. Moreover, a kind of chess game was going on between French collaborators and German diplomats, in which positions and spheres of influence were played out in post-war France. And this while the troops of the Western Allies were already in Paris!

On August 29, 1944, Doriot negotiated with Ribbentrop, during which the Foreign Minister of the Third Reich promised that "with the exception of Alsace-Lorraine, France will maintain its territorial integrity after the end of the war." At the same time, Louis Francois Celine, a well-known writer who adhered to anarcho-fascist views, stated: "The whole of Europe is in the ass! It's in the ass!" At the same time, the newspapers of the French collaborators, this time published in the territory of the Reich, continued to conjure the "New Europe". In a disturbing echo, information began to reach Germany that in France the German-oriented intellectuals Georges Sory and Paul Chat were executed - they were just ardent champions of a "united Europe".

Even when there was no doubt that Germany had lost the war, the French collaborators hiding in the rapidly shrinking territory of the Reich preferred to cherish their pipe dreams. For example, in January 1945, the so-called "French Liberation Committee" was formed from the fugitive French. In the founding manifesto of this puppet organization, one could read: "We intend to regain the independence of our country. We are fighting for a European space that is viable and that will ensure the existence of our people. We stand for a united Europe that is capable of defeating Bolshevism." As you can see, "united Europe" has become the slogan of the "last hour" - a propaganda ploy designed to somehow prolong the agony of the Third Reich. Ho Dorio did not seem to want to see this. In February 1945, he even managed to sum up the first results of the activities of the committee he headed. In particular, he emphasized that Berlin guaranteed the territorial integrity of the "Federal Reich of France" (!!!). Then he again spoke in favor of "the unification of the continent through reverence for the historical traditions of the Western peoples." An article with these words appeared in collaborationist newspapers on February 22, 1945. The irony of fate was that on this very day Dorio died during an air raid.

Illusions about a "united Europe" were experienced not only by Doriot, but also by his longtime rival, the head of the collaborationist party "National Popular Unity" Marcel Déat. Once he was a radical socialist, but then he moved to the camp of adherents of Eurofascism. Marcel Déat considered it necessary to form a united authoritarian Europe, in which Germany had a special mission. In August 1940, Dea wrote in one of

articles: "Germany must move from war to peace, from conquest to cooperation, from hegemony to treaty relations. Since a military victory is the most indisputable of victories, it made Germany the ruler of the continent, which places a special mission on her. She must lead Europe. The power of victory gives not only rights, but also imposes duties.

Like most French collaborators, Marcel Déat advocated the unification of Europe, which was to take place under the condition of "preserving the national identity of the peoples, without opposing one nation to another." future continental

organizations Marcel Déat called the "European Community". In the community he envisioned, France was to acquire a new sovereignty. Strange as it may seem, the pan-European ideas of the pre-war period were very popular among collaborators. This can explain Dea's designs, which bore little resemblance to Hitler's ideas about the "new space". In particular, the head of the collaborationist "National People's Unity" wrote in one of the articles: "The moment will come when individual nations will merge into one community, when they will fit snugly against each other like hewn stones. The construction of this united New Europe can be compared to the finest medieval cathedral."

Georges Albertini, secretary of the same "National Popular Unity", also adhered to the ideas of the "European Community", in which supposedly all peoples were supposed to preserve their own characteristics. Such a naive understanding of the "new Europe" he outlined at the end of 1943 in one of the newspaper articles. In it, he wrote: "Considering that at the conference in Moscow the three powers declared their imperialism, the New Europe will simply be called upon to respect the interests of the nations. Their confrontation provoked several major conflicts in Europe in the 19th-20th centuries. Nevertheless, Europe is too ancient a territory in which too many national features have developed. The first condition is that Europe is inconceivable without Germany, without Serbia or without Belgium."

The intention to support the Third Reich in the name of building a "just Europe" was either the greatest stupidity or the greatest meanness that a young politician could be capable of. However, many of the French intellectuals took just such a position. Although they did not belong to any specific collaborationist party, they nevertheless considered the military defeat of their country as a prerequisite for building a "common Europe", in which "all obsolete structures and concepts would be thrown overboard." The German occupation, as it were, drew France into the "continental bloc", in which she received a special mission. This idea was expressed by Eduard Wintermeier in his book *Europe on the March*, which was published in France in 1943. On its pages, he wrote: "In order to really participate in European development, France must descend to the level of the true and primary qualities of its people. The repeated and universal awakening of the forces of the people will make it possible to create a New France in a New Europe. If we act like this

only in this way, we will be able to connect our future with everything that is the true values of our past ... We will not be able to refuse this either for our own sake or for the sake of Europe. After choosing a new path, the French people will have to unite with the New Germany, which will ultimately give rise to the New Europe.

As you can see, the recipe for creating a "European Union" through the unification and reconciliation of Germany and France was invented not at all by civil politicians of the post-war period, but by collaborators of the occupation period. Actually, many of the now popular slogans were generated in the same environment at the same time. For example, this refers to the phrase of the German professor Wilhelm Grimm, which became very popular among French collaborators: "Germany is our Patronymic, France is your Fatherland, Europe is our common Fatherland." Such ideas not only inspired, but literally ignited Francis Delyazy, who collaborated with the German occupation authorities. A member of syndicalist and pan-European circles before the war, he viewed the Second World War as a kind of repetition of the revolutionary war of 1792, which changed the European continent once and for all (and in the end, European integration - both under Napoleon and under Hitler - turned out to be only the basis

for aggression against Russia - for sure, this is the lot of all European integrations, in fact, like their inglorious death). He outlined similar ideas in the book *The European Revolution*, which was published in Paris in 1942. A year later it was translated into German and republished in Berlin. What so interested German politicians in the work of the French writer? He proposed to create something like the United States of Europe, based on an economic base, namely a common currency, unified wages and a common standard of living. However, in Germany itself, these ideas were needed not for implementation, but for manipulating the occupied territories. Why use force if there is a donkey who willingly runs after an inaccessible carrot?

Chapter 10. Eurofascism for the European Union

Strange as it may seem, there is still no well-established and generally applicable definition of fascism in scientific circles. Perhaps the reason for this lies in the fact that many historians, as well as political scientists, are inclined to see in fascism a purely chauvinistic (that is, extremely nationalistic), but by no means a transnational model of ideology. However, at one time, many of the theorists of European fascism, for example, the Englishman Oswald Mosley and the Frenchman Pierre Drieux la Rochelle, believed that the era of the traditional nation-state was a thing of the past. During the Spanish Civil War (from 1936 to 1938) - and Drieux la Rochelle and Mussolini already in their perception of the First World War - and the internationalization of the armed forces associated with it (including on the Francoist side), right-wing European intellectuals began to think about to interpret fascism as the engine of a pan-European transformation in which nations, through country-specific "fascist revolutions", could create a "third bastion" capable of resisting the United States and the Soviet Union, proclaimed "materialistic superpowers"

As early as January 1921, Mussolini declared: "Either politics and life in Europe will be able to achieve unity, or the axis of world history will finally shift to the other side of the Atlantic, and from then on Europe will play only a second-rate role in the history of mankind." At the same time, various representatives of the right-wing radical intelligentsia understood fascism primarily as an all-encompassing uprising against materialism and rationalism, as a struggle against bourgeois decadence, the helplessness of parliamentary democracy, which was unable to solve the social and national problems of European states.

Common to the theorists of Eurofascism was that the protection of the indigenous peoples of Europe was for them an absolute priority and that Europe - in the spirit of the interpretations of Carl Schmitt - seemed to them a "big space", in whose affairs all other powers of the world should not interfere. At the same time, the corporate economic system should ensure the economic satisfaction of demand and prevent the "Old World" from degrading to the American market, while the forced class reconciliation throughout Europe through the participation of workers in the income of enterprises should deprive

soil communist rhetoric of the class struggle. Eurofascist tendencies in the interwar period existed in many right-wing radical movements in Europe, but this is precisely the main problem: there was no international organization that, like the Comintern, would determine a single direction of activity and approve a common program. The ideological differences between individual countries are strikingly great, and in particular the racial question becomes an important point of conflict. If the Spanish Falangists José Antonio Primo de Rivera considered the racial question non-existent, since the Spanish nation was a historical formation for them, and not a racial or linguistic one, then other fascist movements in Europe, such as the Scandinavian ones, from 1933 were increasingly oriented towards German National Socialism. For these reasons, Eurofascism remained for many years only an intellectual variety of fascism.

Nevertheless, the desire to give Eurofascism an organizational and programmatic shell took place from various sides. The first Congress of Eurofascists was held on December 16-17, 1934 under the motto: "Universal Fascism". The event took place in the Swiss town of Montreux on

Lake Geneva with the participation of representatives of fourteen countries. Among the invited guests were, for example: the National Front movement led by retired military Arthur Fonzhalla (1875-1944), representatives of the Austrian "Austrofascist" Heimwehr ("domestic self-defense"), Irish "blue shirts", Belgians, Greeks, Norwegians, the Dutch, the Romanian guards, Mussolini's envoys, and various French groups, including the Francists of Marcel Bucard. We must immediately make a reservation that back in November 1932, the European Congress was held in Italy, but it did not have a clear fascist character, because most of the participants represented the nationalist and liberal-conservative circles of their countries. For example, then among the participants one could meet Pierre Haxot, Stefan Zweig and Hjalmar Schacht.

If we talk about the event in 1934, then the representatives of the Spanish "Phalanx" initially refused the invitation. They considered themselves National Syndicalists, and therefore distanced themselves from fascism. But then they nevertheless sent their representatives to Switzerland. A complete change of views among the Falangists occurred only during the years of the civil war. Initially, the Falangists were not consistent supporters of the rebellious General Franco. big

importance was attached to emphasizing that phalangism was allegedly a purely Spanish phenomenon. This was a defensive position, dictated by the desire to be considered something primordially one's own, independent, organically grown out of Spanish history, and not at all a simple copy of fascist Italy, as was voiced in the accusations against the Falangists by the Republicans and left.

Representatives of National Socialist Germany did not come to the Swiss congress of Eurofascists at all. Given the very tense relations between Nazi Germany and Austro-fascist Austria, which was supported by fascist Italy, in the Third Reich in those days the word "fascist" had a clearly negative connotation. As a result, it becomes clear to all delegates that a "black international" as some kind of alternative to the Comintern will not be created. The Italian-based "Committees for the Universalization of the Experience of Rome" clearly could not claim this role. As a result, three "Eurofascist principles" were developed at the plenary sessions:

- "the struggle of European youth against communism and capitalist egoism";
- "the spread of corporatism";
- "respect for the national characteristics of peoples."

After that, the disappointed Mussolini abandoned the project to create a "United States of Europe", although in 1935 two more Eurofascist congresses took place: in Paris and Amsterdam. However, after 1938, many fascist movements came under the growing influence of German National Socialism more and more. Italian fascism is losing its former influence. Only in 1942 did a plan emerge in Italy to create a "Pan-European Federation of Fascist Nations". In 1943, in one of the points of the Verona Program, this federation will be designated as a long-term goal. This program states that it is necessary to create a European community in the form of a confederation of all countries, which will overcome capitalism and wars to change borders and thereby bring prosperity, freedom and security to Europe.

Among the numerous nationalist movements of the interwar period, the British fascists, led by Oswald Mosley, always stood apart. Mosley came from an aristocratic family of Anglo-Irish origin and received a good education in various elite educational institutions. During the First World War, he became an officer in the newly created Royal Air Force, but a year before

At the end of the war, he was forced to leave military service due to injury. Oswald Mosley rose to prominence in Great Britain when, in 1918, as the youngest MP for

The Conservative Party ("Tory") ended up in Parliament. However, Mosley categorically disagreed with the British policy, which was carried out on the territory of Ireland. In those days, the so-called "Black and White" - volunteer detachments of recently demobilized British soldiers - ruthlessly cracked down on supporters of Irish independence, which happens without any objections and criticism from the government and parliament. Mosley's harsh criticism of the party leadership, which tacitly allows this, leads to his break with the conservatives.

He spends the next two terms in parliament as a representative of independent political forces. And only after that he joins the "unborn" Labor Party. In 1924, Mosley conquers Birmingham, once a stronghold of the Conservatives. However, having already been appointed in 1929 to the post of junior minister - without a specific area of activity, he cannot implement in this government the economic and political program he has long cherished - the Birmingham Proposals. First of all, Mosley was worried about mass unemployment, and therefore he was forced to resign. In 1931, he founded the "New Party", but the project was unsuccessful - his offspring suffered a crushing defeat in the elections. After that, he, as a "patriotic socialist," goes to Mussolini's Italy, from where he returns as a fanatical adherent of fascism, now striving for a similar model for Great Britain.

In 1932, Oswald Mosley managed to unite the largest fascist and pro-fascist groups in the British Union of Fascists. At the peak of its organizational activity, which took place in 1938, the union consisted of about 45 thousand people. Geographically, Chelsea was the stronghold of the British Union of Fascists, where the headquarters of the organization, the Black House, was located. Mosley was also very influential in London's East End, an area populated predominantly by workers. There, in the 1937 elections, the British Union of Fascists received 19% of the vote. However, Mosley's "black shirts" do not get into the House of Commons, since the British majoritarian restrictive suffrage (Westminster system) severely limited the passage of small parties into Parliament. Since during the Second World War, Mosley came under suspicion as a potential

defeatist, then he, a passionate opponent of the war, was interned by government troops along with 800 of his comrades. After the war, Mosley founded the Unionist Movement and openly demanded the creation of a "State of Europe". Mosley derives this idea from the double threat to Europe from both the West and the East, and he understood his ideas not as strongly anti-Soviet and anti-American, but as "a sober perception of reality." According to Mosley's theory, only with a clear division of blocs and the creation of a united Europe is a stable peace possible in a multipolar world.

To prevent further cultural Americanization of the West, a new ethnos must be created - the "Nation of Europe". In this unified European state, Mosley saw by no means an equivalent of the American concept of the "melting crucible", on the contrary, only such a unified state, in his opinion, could preserve and develop the strength of autonomous, national European cultures, thanks to which Europe would supposedly be saved from "universal leveling and

mixing."

In his journalistic works, along with the programmatic book "I Believe in Europe" ("World Alternative"), "We Live Tomorrow", "European Socialism" up to his autobiographical work "My Life", Mosley developed the idea of a European state in the European-African economic space ("Eurafrica"), which in the future global economic struggle and the struggle for resources could guarantee the Europeans the possibility of an imaginary independent existence and would overcome the "crazy" fratricidal wars.

Between pre-war and post-war only his terminology changes: after 1945, Mosley, for tactical reasons, abandons the term "fascism" and speaks instead of "European socialism" (today's Western politicians also like to use the term

"Eurosocijalizam"). But its main themes remain the same, and Mosley's political theoretical construction thus no doubt also deserves the name "Eurofascism" after the end of the war.

The German researcher Benedict Kaiser in his work on the "bourgeois decline" noted: "Like the French fascist Drieu la Rochelle, the British fascist Mosley asks his associates and countrymen to abandon the ideas of intra-European revenge and competition of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in favor of a common European consciousness, and to defend a common Europe before the rest of the world. He himself is the first to take a step in this direction as an example and becomes the first

an English nationalist who stands for the right of the Irish to unite - "right to unite", for a united Ireland in a united Europe. The state of Europe, according to Mosley, needs an economic and social policy consistent with science and technology. With a state-run "price and wage mechanism" that would form the basis of a common European economic policy, and with a European government that would direct the economy but not control it, a single state would, in his view, be a boon to all European peoples. Wage levels in European regions would level out, and social legislation would also have to be unified in order to reduce intra-European differences in living standards."

To possible criticism that mass ethnic migrations would occur in a single "state-Europe" deprived of internal borders, Mosley argued that due to the pan-European equalization of economies, people would not have any need to leave their homeland for economic reasons. Allegedly, the problems of raw materials will not really be problems, because due to the creation of a large space of Eurafrika and the associated access to African resources, the European semi-continent will provide itself with autarky.

Therefore, the removal of the question of space and the question of wages from the agenda is, according to Mosley, the foundations for a successful economic and social policy in a united Europe. "If these two main issues are resolved, the basis for a promising pan-European economy will emerge." In addition, it was supposed to organize free enterprise and share participation of workers in the profits of enterprises, as well as class self-government. All these points were designated by Oswald Mosley as "the guarantor of the new prosperity of Europe."

Along with the economic and social necessity of the "Nation of Europe", even before the start of the war in 1939, Mosley pointed out the need for a united "state-Europe" in terms of power and defense policy in order to prevent the collapse of the great powers, among which Mosley included France, Great Britain and Germany. As you can see, the plans set up by the British fascist Oswald Mosley were successfully implemented by Western politicians who like to call themselves liberals.

The same can be said about the ideas of the French fascist Pierre

Drieu la Rochelle. Already during the First World War, he became a kind of "pan-European". Over time, Drieu la Rochelle becomes "a key theorist of Eurofascism". The Turn to Europe begins in Drieu la Rochelle's journalism with the publication of *The Measure of France*, a work published five years after the end of the First World War. However, as the researchers note, even earlier in the collection of military poems, the stanzas of which the French soldier Drieu la Rochelle dedicates to his German opponents on the other side of the trenches, his desire to unite European nations is already noticeable.

In 1922, Drieu la Rochelle demanded for the first time the unification of Europe on the basis of the right of peoples to self-determination. The prerequisite for the implementation of such a project for him was the reconciliation between Germany and France, for which he advocated publicly. Four years later - when the German-French "primordial enmity" was again and again raised to the banners in French

right-wing nationalist camp - he demanded the separation of nationalism from reactionary militarism. Nevertheless, already in 1928, in the essay "Geneva or Moscow", he abandoned this idea, as well as rejected petty-bourgeois nationalism as such. According to Drieux la Rochelle, it was petty-bourgeois aspirations that prevented European rapprochement, without which Europe would face a final "sunset".

The prerequisite for the creation of the "United States of Europe", according to Drieux la Rochelle, could be the economic union of nations. The theorist of French fascism insisted on maintaining the colonial possessions of the Europeans, which he would like to distribute proportionally among individual countries, and which could allow Europe to exist as a completely economically independent, that is, autarkic territory. He was a determined opponent of "the economic imperialism of the Americans and the Soviet ideological expansion": "Europe is threatened by American capitalism and Russian imperialism [...]. This is a battlefield where both systems are openly opposed to each other. Drieux la Rochelle held similar beliefs until 1934. He believed that unification should be carried out on the foundation of "disciplined capitalism" and a politically united Europe. Together with Bertrand de Jouvenel, Drieux la Rochelle became an activist in the France-Europe League, after which he wrote an article for the socialist magazine New Europe. There, along with him, other future fascists are also published, such as Paul Marion, Georges Suarez, Alfred Fabre-Luce and the aforementioned

de Jouvenel.

In 1931, Drieux la Rochelle wrote an essay, "Europe Against Patronymics", in which he dealt in great detail with the problem of intra-European borders. The confrontation between Italy, France and Germany in the struggle for Savoy, Corsica and Alsace-Lorraine could not be stopped once and for all. Therefore, Drieux la Rochelle anticipated the current Western politicians and adopted the slogan that autonomy is the only adequate solution. If there were no economic prerequisites for regional independence, Drieux la Rochelle recommended accession to the respective neighboring country, which would be decided by the population in a referendum. At the same time, "territorial disputes" in Eastern Europe should be regulated by treaties between minorities, taking into account separate requirements for redrawing borders. In resolving these European issues of borders, Drieux saw the overcoming of the last obstacles to European unification.

In his essay "Geneva or Moscow," Drieux la Rochelle suggested that the colonial possessions should have been preserved. During the following years, Drieux la Rochelle came to the conclusion that his "vision of Europe" had no chance of being realized within the framework of the Third Republic and the "League of Nations". He simultaneously feels contempt for both liberals and "old conservatives", which ultimately makes Pierre Drieux la Rochelle a fascist. He was inspired by the idea of abandoning bourgeois Europe and turning to a "new type of person" - cleansed of national grievances and devoid of individualism. Therefore, some French intellectuals were of the opinion that fascism is, first of all, "European rapprochement, cleansed of national egoism and breathing air." Drieux la Rochelle fully shared this idea. He wrote: "Fascism was not a political doctrine for us, it was not an economic doctrine, it was not an imitation of foreign models, and our meetings with foreign fascisms only led to the fact that we could better understand national identity, and not least our. But fascism is a spirit. First, the anti-conformist, anti-bourgeois spirit, and irreverent audacity are part of it. This is a spirit that opposes prejudice, both class and all others. It is also the spirit of friendship that we wish to rise to the spirit of friendship between

nations."

It follows from the above passage that in the coming "united (fascist) Europe" one should have honored the "national

originality", features of each nation. This naive conviction can also be found in Drieux la Rochelle himself. In the epilogue of his novel "Gilles" the hero enters into a dialogue about the fate of Europe with one

Falangist, after which he turns to himself in his thoughts: "What was Europe, what was it supposed to be? The various powers must communicate with each other without hindering or injuring any of them, all countries should be respected, and their independent life should be preserved. The League of Nations was only a pale abstraction, a humiliation for various powerful beings. Nations must unite under one all-encompassing vast concept, a sign that guarantees the autonomy of all sources - respectively, both special for each of them, and universal.

The rejection of classical conservatism and patriotism and the transnational, "pan-European" is depicted in Drieu la Rochelle's novel *Gilles*. The work shows a dispute between three fascists - an Irishman, a Pole and a Frenchman Gilles, who at that moment is still speaking under the pseudonym Walter - they first reflect on the future union of Catholicism and fascism. Then Drieu la Rochelle, through the mouth of a Pole, states: "In the end, we must choose between nationalism and fascism." The Irishman O'Connor echoes him: "Nationalism is obsolete. What the democratic countries did not achieve in Geneva, the fascist powers will be able to do. They will create the unity of Europe."

Drieu la Rochelle foresaw that a new continental war (World War II would begin just a few days after the novel was published) would "destroy" universal, Western European fascism, giving the advantage to German-centric National Socialism. As a result, one of the heroes of the novel ends the discussion with the words: "A patriotic European spirit must arise against the invasion of the Russian armies into Europe. This spirit can develop only if Germany from the very beginning integrates the integrity of the fatherlands, of all the fatherlands of Europe. Only then can Germany fulfill the task that is destined for her in view of her strength and the traditions of the Holy Roman-German Empire: to determine the European line of the future.

Decades later, Western liberal politicians would begin the formation of the European Union precisely under the slogan "Europe of the Fatherlands", but at the end of the 1930s, such a step was expected from Nazi Germany. Drieu la Rochelle dreamed of building a European state on the model of the medieval Holy Roman Empire of the German peoples. He continued to dream even when Germany occupied France. IN

those days he writes many pro-German articles in which he praises Hitler's foreign policy. The pro-Nazi and pro-German position did not exclude some doubts, which eventually began to overcome Pierre Drieu la Rochelle. He either rejoices at the defeat of the bourgeois republic, or intends to emigrate to England. As a result, his anti-democratism turns out to be stronger than love for the Motherland - he prefers to go over to the side of Nazi Germany. He works in occupied Paris instead of participating in the Vichy "national revolution", which he rejects because the patriarchal regime seems hopelessly outdated to him, and he despises the man behind Pétain, the former socialist Pierre Laval.

Drieu La Rochelle often meets in Paris with the German diplomat Otto Abetz and explains to him his idea of a single fascist party, which should take all French politics into its own hands and enter into a military alliance with the Axis powers. Abetz flatly rejects this proposal; on the one hand, he would like to save his friend from disappointment, on the other hand, he does not have sufficient authority to make such political decisions. In addition, by this time there was still no clear position of Hitler regarding Europe. Vain hopes can be explained by the fact that Drieu la Rochelle's German interlocutors in Paris were Ernst Junger, Karl Epting, Otto Abets. They did not show any Francophobia, but they were not convinced Nazis either. Disappointed, Drieu la Rochelle plunges into the work of collaborationist newspapers, on the pages of which he actively promotes the idea of a "united Europe". In the depths of his soul, he understands that these are just pipe dreams. Now Drieu la Rochelle considers the foreign policy of the Third Reich "obsolete". He writes about this: "1. She could have rejected any gesture that was reminiscent of the old politics of military conquest, diplomatic prejudice, and economic confiscations. It would not hang German banners on public buildings and would not abolish national banners and national anthems; she would avoid parades. She would respect national autonomy everywhere

in administrative and political terms and would not carry out annexations in the old spirit, like the annexations of Bohemia, Alsace, Northern France, Poland. It would not be in a hurry to confiscate and seize the property of private enterprises, societies, machine parks, factories and banking institutions. deposits.

2. On the other hand, it would release prisoners of war, would hold plebiscites in order to conclude at least temporary peace treaties between peoples;

it would abolish customs borders and introduce a European customs union.

3. In the most serious and profound way, it would move from state policy to > interstate politics; it would link its national policy with international politics. Thus, it could properly resist the nations that are its biggest adversaries: Russia, which has at its disposal a communist international, an Orthodox international, and possibly a Muslim international, as well as America and Great Britain, which have democratic, masonic, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Internationals. The 'Europe' slogan had to be brought to life in a concrete, positive and unambiguous way through eye-catching, profound and comprehensive activities."

Drieux la Rochelle believed that the two most important events in the first days of the occupation would have to be referendums and the creation of a "European Union", the military basis of which would be the SS, which would thereby rise to the "rallying point of the militant youth of Europe." Through the European integration of the armed forces, the occupation of European countries would acquire a different character, since the "pro-European" "French would fulfill their military duty in France, the Czechs in Bohemia and the Norwegians in Norway." In addition to the military component, the creation of a Eurosocialist International was planned, the location of which Pierre la Rochelle saw either in Brussels or in Strasbourg. Concerning the "European Union", he wrote: "Why would it be necessary to annex Alsace, if from the day when Germany ceases to be Germany in order to dissolve into Europe, the whole of Europe, one way or another, becomes German?" It should be noted that Drieux La Rochelle, in his own way, presciently foresaw the events in the vastness of Europe, only they were already implemented without Hitler, without the Third Reich, without Eurofascism and using completely different slogans. Although the ideas with Brussels, Strasbourg and "Eurosociatism" turned out to be very tenacious.

Chapter 11

Among Russian officials there is such a saying: "Any case goes through four stages - hype, confusion, punishment of the innocent, rewarding the uninvolved." The phrase about "rewarding the uninvolved" perfectly characterizes the historical process, when certain individuals ascribe to themselves a "glorious past", which is very popular among imaginary anti-fascists, who appeared in an incredible number in the 50s of the twentieth century. For example, the actress Marlene Dietrich loved to tell (and after her this story was repeated by all kinds of media) about how in the 30s she almost kicked German diplomats out of a Paris hotel room who dared to offer her cooperation with the Goebbels ministry. In reality, Marlene Dietrich regularly transferred a considerable percentage of her fees to the fund of the Imperial Chamber of Cinematography, which was part of the Imperial Chamber of Culture created by Goebbels, almost at the first whistle appeared in the German consulates, where she politely smiled, made meaningful hints - in a word, from She tried her best not to be deprived of her German passport. Only in the summer of 1939, having received American citizenship, did she allow herself indefatigable fantasies about her active anti-fascism.

Something similar can be said about the founder of the Pan-European Union, Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi. In the official legend, he is presented as an anti-fascist, whose work the Nazis burned at the stake. Say, a member of the Masonic lodge "Humanitas", "infected" Aristide Briand, Konrad Adenauer, Thomas Mann and many other ideas

built on the principles of peace, harmony and culture of a united Europe aroused wild hostility among the Nazis of all stripes. Except for the fact that the works of Coudenhove-Kalergi really got on the list of books banned in the Third Reich, otherwise the entire creative biography of this Austrian is nothing more than a myth, brought to life in the 50s by the political realities of post-war Europe. In order to become an ideological anti-fascist, it is by no means enough to be rejected by the German National Socialists. For example, they hated the fascists who came to power in Austria as a result of the 1933 coup (Austrofascist regime). And the radical National Socialists created by Otto Strasser

"Black Front" has always positioned themselves as "consistent anti-fascists."

Now politically correct Western politicians, and after them helpful European historians, are diligently "forgetting" the most unseemly pages in the history of the "pan-European idea". But, as they say, everything secret sooner or later becomes clear... In March 1923, the leading newspapers of the world reproduced an open letter from Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi, addressed to Benito Mussolini, who had recently come to power. It is significant that the original text of the letter was sent by the founder of the Pan-European Union to the editors of the Austrian nationalist newspaper *Neu Frei Press*. The editors of this publication, published in Vienna, published a letter on February 21, 1923. It was from the pages of this newspaper that an open letter addressed to the leader of the fascist movement went on a "round-the-world trip".

With what words did the person who is now called the "greatest humanist" address the creator of fascism? "On behalf of the youth of our continent, I ask you to save Europe! Two of the three nations that emerged from the foundation of the Carolingian Empire (the Germans and the French) have been in a state of protracted war with each other for a millennium. Only the third nation - united Italy - is called by the Almighty himself to put an end to the fratricidal confrontation, to become the cornerstone of a united Europe, to serve the cause of its revival. You selflessly love Italy. Your spirit is imbued with its life and its development. But no nation can prosper in a dying world. The true prosperity of Italy is possible only in a healthy Europe; in disease-stricken Europe, Italy will surely wither away. Anyone who loves his country today must certainly love Europe as a whole. Like the great Italian of the last century, Giuseppe Mazzini, you must be not just a respectable Italian, but also a good European. Look beyond the Atlantic. While Europe, torn by contradictions from the Rhine to Thrace, is plunged into suffering, poverty and bitterness, on another continent representatives of the nations of the entire hemisphere will soon meet to establish a Pan-American Union in a spirit of mutual trust, which will promote the cause of peace and progress. A hundred years ago, the Pan-American idea proclaimed by Simon Bolivar is today becoming the main hope of all mankind. While a united America is ready to lead the whole world, wounded in

In fratricidal wars, Europe dooms itself to death. Put an end to this suffering and this shame! While the creation of Pan-America is being prepared in Santiago, convene the first pan-European conference in Rome! Rome, as a stronghold of the Caesars and Pontiffs, must become the cradle of the New Europe! Britain, with its might, has become an intercontinental power, Russia a Eurasian one. Both of these powers went beyond the borders of Europe, and therefore were able to avoid collapse. But the other peoples of Europe must be bound by a common destiny. They have only one alternative: either unite or perish. Convoke representatives of national governments who feel responsible for the future of our continent to create an unshakable Pan-European Union capable of putting an end to the enmity of Germany and France! The time has come for an analogue of the Monroe Doctrine to be worked out for our continent: "Europe for Europeans!" Pan-Europe needs agreement with its neighbor, Great Britain. The creation of a system of lawful decisions and disarmament on land and at sea are not too high a price to pay for friendship with this power. Nobody threatens Europe from the North! We face an economic threat from the West, and a political one from the East. A divided Europe is sure to fall prey to American enterprise; a divided Europe will fall under Russian hegemony. Only economic unification and political blocking can ensure peace, independence and prosperity for Europe. Should Russia recover from economic chaos, for

which is enough for a few harvest years, as white or red Cossacks will water their horses in the waters of the Adriatic. Our generation will not have time to leave, as culture in divided Europe will be swept away by the second migration of peoples. You are the heir of Gaius Marius and Caesar. Therefore, you are able to postpone the second migration of peoples for many centuries. It is in your power to overcome the European crisis. You will be able to determine whether the borders of Europe and Eurasia will pass through the swamps of the Dniester and the Commune of Rokino, or along the Rhine and the Alps. Ancient Greece collapsed because it gave birth to the idea of Pan-Hellenism too late. Save Europe from her evil fate! Fearlessly tackle the problems of Europe plunged into chaos, lay the foundation of the United States of Europe! Then the memory of you will be blessed, and your descendants will immortalize your name!"

The letter is very candid. It is doubly interesting that the "godfather of European integration" turns to the fascist dictator with a request to save Europe not from the "Bolshevik hordes of Asians" (propaganda

clichés of nationalist propaganda in the interwar period), but from Russia, which adopted the Eurasian vector of development. The Russophobic component of the pan-European idea is more than obvious - for Coudenhove-Kalergi, the political system established in Russia is not even important ("white or red Cossacks will water their horses"). Another reader may notice that flirting with Italian fascism in the 1920s was characteristic of a significant number of political forces. Indeed, it is. But only by the beginning of the 1930s the true face of fascism was obvious to many. And this did not at all prevent Coudenhove-Kalergi, on the one hand, from meeting with Mussolini (the most significant meeting took place on May 10, 1933), and on the other hand, from advising the Austrofascist government oriented towards Italy. If in Germany the books of the theoretician of the pan-European idea were put on fire, then in fascist Italy he felt more than at ease. It was from May 1933 that one could observe the closest cooperation between the actions of the ideologists of fascism and theorists of the pan-European idea. Moreover, the "Eurofascist" magazine *October* ("October") published in Italy, according to Coudenhove-Kalergi himself, "becomes a de facto herald of the pan-European idea." To a modern person who is largely dominated by Western political myths, such a symbiosis may seem not only strange, but unnatural and even impossible. But to contemporaries, such a fusion of ideas seemed logical and organic. A few years before the French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand, impressed by the ideas of Coudenhove-Kalergi, proposed the creation of a "Pan-Europe", Mussolini had already made attempts to form the "United Fascist States of Europe" at the suggestion of Coudenhove-Kalergi.

If we talk about Italian-style fascism, then, unlike German national socialism, it to a greater extent claimed universalism and some kind of transnationality. It is this that can explain the general (albeit short-lived) fascination of Europeans with fascism, which could be observed throughout the 20s of the twentieth century. If the foreign policy of the Third Reich was built solely on a position of strength and the desire for dominance, then Mussolini was primarily focused on the "export of fascism", for which he took into account numerous internal European contradictions, often showing miracles of resourcefulness. Already in the 1920s, Mussolini realized that fascism could act as an ideological model not only for a single

country, but also for the European continent as a whole. In 1927, he wrote about this: "In its historical manifestation, fascism is a purely Italian phenomenon, but its doctrine is universal. Fascism is capable of solving problems that are generally inherent in many peoples, primarily those peoples who are tired of the democratic and liberal regimes established in their countries.

After several years of meetings and negotiations with Coudenhove-Kalergi, in 1932 Mussolini nevertheless decided to hold a "pan-European congress" in Rome. Despite the fact that such terms as "Pan-Europe" and "United States of Europe" were not used at the event, numerous scientists, public figures and economists gathered in the Italian capital discussed specific models of European integration, which

considered as a process coming in the very near future. At the Congress of Rome, not abstract things were considered, but quite pressing issues: options for creating a pan-European customs union, details of pan-European citizenship, the formation of a "Council of Europe", which, on the one hand, could be an associate member of the League of Nations, on the other hand, act as its alternative. It is indicative that there was a common recognition of the fact that narrowly ethnic nationalisms had to be consigned to the past, relying on the fascist model established by authoritarian means in each of the European countries.

It could be considered that the ideas voiced at the Congress of Rome remained ideas if it were not for the Action Committees for the Universalization of Rome (KAUR) created on July 15, 1933, headed by General of the Fascist Militia Eugenio Kozelski. It was not just the organizing committee of the "fascist international", but the first structure in history that dealt with the problems of practical European integration. The main task of the KAUR was to establish relations with all European countries in order to identify in them political movements and organizations sympathetic to fascism. It was they who were to become the basis for the creation of the alleged "United Fascist States of Europe." As you can see, the export of fascism got along well with the ideas of the formation of a "United Europe". Fascism was not just proclaimed a universal doctrine, but an integration force capable of uniting Europe, making it the center of Rome. If only for this reason, Mussolini's European integration aspirations were watched with great suspicion in the Third Reich. Hitler's supporters

obsession with racist ideas, did not at all consider National Socialism as a universal idea, and even more so as an object of "widespread export". It should be noted that Hitler's relations with Mussolini for a long time were not so much allied as competing. In the first half of the 1930s, there was no "political misalliance" - the dictators were more like "sworn friends" than "ideological allies". As a result, when in December 1934 the KAUR held the All-European Fascist Congress in Montreux, there was not a single member of the NSDAP among the delegates representing 15 parties from 13 countries.

If you study the text of the speech of the head of the KAUR Kozelski, it is striking that his rhetoric almost exactly repeats the lexical turns of the current supporters of wholesale European integration. "Each nation must go its own way and act by its own methods in accordance with its national spirit. But at the same time, the nationalism of each country will be combined with the universalism of the fascist doctrine.... Thus, the idea of supranationality will be in strong harmony with the idea of the national." In addition, in his interview, which Mussolini gave after the end of the congress to the French newspaper Uncompromising ("Intransigent"), the Italian dictator almost verbatim repeated the words once uttered by the French Foreign Minister Aristide Briand. "Europe has created world civilization. Europe spread this civilization and benefited from it. Today, sandwiched between America and Japan, Europe is doomed to collapse. If Europe wants to survive, then it must be at least in internal harmony. Today, the European peoples need something that will unite them - and this is the European spirit. However, such a "citation" is easily explained if we take into account that both Mussolini and Briand were advised by the same person - the creator of the "Pan-European Union" Richard Nikolaus Coudenhove-Kalergi.

Coudenhove-Kalergi was not the only one who believed in the possibility of a symbiosis of fascism and pan-European ideas. When on March 17, 1934, the so-called Rome Protocols were signed between Italy, Austria and Hungary, most of the then political observers assessed this event as "a promising start to the pan-European project." However, as World War II escalated, the contours of a "United Europe" changed. The geopolitical initiative gradually shifted from fascist Italy to

Nazi Germany, which turned to the problem of European integration only under the pressure of circumstances (defeats on the Eastern Front and the demands of a significant part of Western European collaborators). As for Coudenhove-Kalergi, he found new patrons without any problems. Having migrated to the USA in time, after the end of the Second

World War he advised Winston Churchill. It was at the suggestion of Coudenhove-Kalergi that the British politician delivered a speech at the University of Zurich in 1946 in which he called for the creation of a "United States of Europe". And this is almost simultaneously with the Fulton speech, which has become a kind of anti-Russian manifesto!

Historical processes are sometimes comparable to simple life situations. How often (alas, alas) one has to hear that a uniform scoundrel and scoundrel grows out of a "child angel". In some cases, upbringing is to blame, in some cases it is genetics. Looking at the political events of these days, many observers are surprised: how did fascists and extremists come to rule on the Euromaidan, which stands up for "humanistic European values"? If these observers had known the real history of the European Union, they would probably have been a little less surprised. And why be surprised if fascist and anti-Russian genes were originally laid in the DNA of the "European Union".

Chapter 12

closed field

Probably, now it is no secret to anyone that language politics can be not just an instrument of influence on public opinion, but even a formidable geopolitical weapon. The formation of the "European Union", in fact, as the formation of the idea of a "united Europe" as a whole, was hardly possible without taking into account many linguistic factors.

Among the bosses from National Socialism, the first and for a long time almost the only champion of a "united Europe" was the ideologist of the Nazi party - Alfred Rosenberg. A native of the Russian Empire, he nevertheless, even during his stay in St. Petersburg, was known as one of the most violent Russophobes, diligently sticking out his "Europeanness". Already in 1925, in one of his articles published on September 13 on the pages of the newspaper "Völkischer Beobachter", he actively discussed the question: was there a need to form the "United States (that is, states) of Europe." However, at that time Rosenberg was debating on such a great variety of issues that one could hardly assume that he had reached the level of awareness of language policy. It is possible that the problem of a "united Europe" came to the attention of the ideologist of the Nazi party only because European integration slogans played a big role in the political program of the Italian fascists, as well as in the political guidelines of the movement, which is commonly called Austrofascism. One of the leaders of Austrofascism, and later Chancellor of Austria, Engelbert Dollfuss was a personal friend of Count Coudenhove-Kalergi and was well acquainted with his work "Pan-Europe". This book was considered so significant in the mid-1920s that even Hitler considered it necessary to dedicate a few lines of criticism to Mein Kampf.

In 1932, Alfred Rosenberg was invited to fascist Rome to take part in the work of the "European Congress". He not only accepts the invitation, but publicly announces his vision of the "European idea". Prior to this, Rosenberg published his programmatic treatise, which he gave the pathetic title - "The Myth of the 20th Century." On the pages of this thick book, the NSDAP ideologue tried to declare everything

"good" that was in Europe "Germanic", and in turn all the "good" that could be found in Germany itself - "Nordic". That is, Rosenberg's interpretation of Europe was purely racial. Such ideas later allowed the employees of the SS organization "Heritage of the Ancestors" to "spread" the borders of Europe to Persia and India. In this case, they were not too original, as they relied on quasi-scientific constructions from the "Myth XX

century."

However, there are less well-known statements that Alfred Rosenberg allowed himself. In particular, he delivered a speech at the first meeting of the "Nordic Society" created by him in 1934. In this speech, he actually laid the foundation for all subsequent European integration programs that were developed in the Third Reich until 1945.

inclusive. It was Alfred Rosenberg who erased the line between ideological anti-communism and rabid Russophobia, often replacing these concepts with each other. He stated: "The judge of Europe is the fate of each European nation separately. Perhaps today we can say that the fate of Europe is the fate of Germany as the largest Central European state. And, conversely, the fate of Germany is the fate of our esteemed part of the world. However, if there had not been a German revival, then the wave of communist chaos would have covered all of Central Europe long ago. This storm would by no means stop on the banks of the Rhine or Oder, but would rush to the very Pillars of Hercules, destroying our thousand-year-old continental civilization in a stream of chaos.

Being an ardent anti-Semite, Rosenberg traditionally linked Russian Bolshevism with the "intrigues of the Jews." However, he was well aware that anti-Semitism did not find a wide response from the public of European countries, in particular from journalists from Scandinavia. For this reason, he decided to make the second component of the "European idea" generalized racism, based on the slogans of "common blood, common soil and common destiny." This component can be found in all the developments that were carried out in the Third Reich. Rosenberg proclaimed: "National Socialism was able to awaken a fiery love for blood, soil and tradition. At the same time, he was able to give other nations an inner awareness of their blood, their character, their soil and their history." In the Third Reich, the ideas of "integral racism" proposed by Alfred Rosenberg were gradually adopted by the Imperial Foreign Office.

Another hallmark of a "united Europe"

According to Rosenberg, its anti-democratism should have become, again being one of the elements of the National Socialist ideology. In this regard, it would be appropriate to cite the following passage: "Europe must be understood not as a debating, but at the same time lifeless international community, but as a sphere of fateful spaces. In this area, the aspirations of each individual must be deeply justified. Only in a justly limited and divided division can the individual become united, having a solid foundation, strong and viable enough to comprehend the commonality of the ancient thousand-year-old culture. This is the only way to protect our peoples and guarantee them proper living conditions among other continents and peoples of the globe." In terms of denying an individual nation the right to true self-determination, "integral racism" is very reminiscent of modern liberalism, ready to sacrifice popular interests in the name of abstract ideas.

In terms of finding a base for the formation of a relatively homogeneous European space, the adherents of National Socialism sometimes went to the strangest tricks, trying to combine seemingly incompatible things with each other. One such attempt was made by a friend of Alfred Rosenberg, a linguist and chemist at the same time, Theodor Stehe. He learned such multidirectional hobbies from his father, Albert Stehe, who was not only the owner of a large chemical company, but also the chairman of the German Esperanto Union. So, Theodor Shtekhe considered it quite natural to link the needs of the new racist regime and the tasks that the adherents of the planned-artificial language, which in 1887 was invented by the Warsaw Jew Lazar Zemenhof, set for themselves. Probably, the supra-ethnicity and supra-state nature of the Esperanto language, which was supposed to be used to form the "new Europe", was taken into account. Theodor Stehe's plans were not destined to come true. He, of course, became a confidant of Rosenberg, but none of the Esperantists received proper independence. All of them were unified within the framework of the "German Language Union".

It should not be forgotten that almost immediately after coming to power, the National Socialists began reprisals against public figures objectionable to them. Lovers of classical literary European languages considered Esperanto to be a purely subversive phenomenon. A similar prejudice appeared during the years of the Weimar Republic, when interest in planned and artificial languages was shown primarily in the workers.

groups. As a result, it turned out that among the German Esperantists there were a huge number of Marxists. When the systematic persecution of communists and social democrats began in 1933, many of the Esperanto lovers found themselves behind bars.

There were, of course, apolitical associations of Esperanto lovers. The National Socialists applied the so-called "salami" tactics to them. At first, the Fuehrer principle was imposed on these unions, that is, they were deprived of any possibility of self-government and collective decision-making. Then a member of the NSDAP was made the chairman of any union, and then Jews and "politically unreliable" were removed from the organization. It usually ended with the unification of public organizations, which completely ceased to exist independently. It can be noted that the pressure on Esperanto speakers actually ceased on the eve of the 1936 Summer Olympics, which were held in Berlin. When the Anschluss of Austria took place, the question arose about the fate of the Austrian Esperantists, the European public hardly showed any interest in this issue.

In fairness, it should be noted that the policy of the National Socialists cannot be assessed as a kind of constant, initially focused on the formation of a "new Europe". The policy of the Third Reich (primarily internal) can be divided into several stages. In the early stages, when the Nazis were just trying to consolidate their power, the "European idea" was either not seen as relevant, or could even be perceived as "anti-imperial" and therefore hostile to the new regime. An example of this is the story of Adalbert Baumann, a Bavarian nationalist who developed his own plans to transform the language space of Europe. Let us make a reservation right away that Bavarian nationalism had many shades, and by no means always could be identified with imperial and pan-German aspirations. An example of this could just be Adalbert Baumann, who was not just a member of the anti-Prussian group, but advocated the independent unification of Bavaria with Austria. However, his political activity of the early period is not of particular interest to us.

Much more attractive from a scientific point of view seems to be the attempt made by Bauman at the height of the First World War to create an artificial language. The output was something resembling a family of high-level programming languages. Bauman called his brainchild "Vede". "Vede" was not completely artificial, that is

100% fictional language. It would be more correct to speak of a constructed dialect. Bauman took as a basis the medieval dialects of Southern Germany, but led him not along the path of complication, as happened in historical reality, but along the path of phonetic simplification. In the 1920s, this linguistic innovator created a new project, "Oirope-Peach," or Opie, as he called it. The new artificial language was intended for common European use.

In 1933, Baumann tried to get his ideas across to Hitler and Goebbels. However, his conversion leads to a completely opposite result than he expected. Bauman was persecuted. It is obvious that the Bavarian minister-president Hans Schemm considered all the Bavarian separatists to be personal enemies and included Adalbert Baumann among them. Since, among other things, Shemm was still the head of the National Socialist Union of Teachers, he did everything possible so that the doors of all schools were closed to Bauman. The experimenter from linguistics is first fired from the gymnasium, and then expelled from the National Socialist Party. It is not known how the fate of A. Bauman would have developed further, however, in 1935, Hans Schemm died in a car accident, after which the linguist was left to himself: they were not particularly interested in his ideas, but on the other hand, they were not subjected to persecution.

It would seem that Bauman's ideas did not have any influence on the formation of the "new Europe", just as they did not find their embodiment in the sphere of practical politics. However, it was Baumann who was one of the first to propose the creation of the Imperial Office of the German Language. In his letter addressed to the leaders of the Third Reich, he wrote: "The Imperial Office of the German Language should take care of the German language and promote its active spread (in a lightweight form) throughout Europe." The appearance of such an institution in 1933 could be

perceived as an urgent political task. Although this did not happen. Later, such an idea began to be actively proposed by the "German Academy" (at the head of which was then the creator of geopolitics, Professor Karl Haushofer). The creation of the Imperial Office of the German Language was planned for 1935, which was timed to coincide with the half-century anniversary of the German Language Union. However, in practice, the German language department was created only in 1941 and not with the status of "imperial", but only as a division of the "German Academy". In part, this could be considered the merit of Bauman. Although inside this institution no one thought
o

reforming the German language and spreading German-centric forms of artificial dialects and dialects all over Europe. Such ideas were brought to light only in the very last years of the Second World War, when the Third Reich tried in vain to maintain its continental hegemony. However, if Hitler and Goebbels supported this idea in 1933, it could hardly bring rich fruits, since Germany clearly did not have enough personnel to implement it.

In our case, it seems very interesting that Bauman not only offered the Nazi bosses to reform the German language (in order to create a common European dialect), but also became a pioneer of the "European Economic Union". In an address addressed to the governments of European countries, he said: "When it is realized that the highest goal is the independent economic consolidation of Europe, then any far-sighted government, regardless of the apparent futility of this undertaking, should see its main task in the widespread promotion of just such a European development. Taking into account the cracks that have run through the body of Europe through political formations, the way to achieve this final goal can only be prepared and paved in the non-political sphere. Even now, we must show an iron will to establish contact between European peoples and overcome the internal isolation of Europe, split by the presence of fifty languages used for interethnic communication.

As the first practical steps in this direction, Bauman proposed:

"1. The emergence of a European commercial and financial language, which will exist in parallel with the remaining inviolable national languages, which should be revered as popular shrines;

2. stimulation of live communication through the introduction of intermediary languages (languages of bridges) for the purpose of mutual understanding, exchange of personnel, increase in the flow of tourists, etc. etc."

According to Bauman, these were to be the first steps of the National Socialist government, which would "allow us to bring Europe as a whole out of the crisis."

With the outbreak of World War II, the problems of language policy within the framework of the "reorganization of the European space" began to acquire strategic importance. Actually, the "European idea" itself became the new slogan of the Nazi Reich. Accordingly, the role

specialists in the field of linguistics and linguistics. It is significant that the leading Germanists of the Reich were invited to the constituent assembly of a special department, which was created in 1940 under the Imperial Ministry of Science. The department bore the eminently descriptive title "Military Use of the Humanities."

The report on the "scientific use of the Germanists in wartime conditions" stated the following: "Modern warfare is for the most part not only a military, but also a spiritual and cultural confrontation, in which the internal structure of the coming Europe is being decided. Therefore, at this decisive historical hour, the German humanities must assess the spiritual and political situation from a perspective, clarify the details and prepare cultural and political ideas on which a new Europe can be based in the future. The practical use of natural sciences is possible in various fields. However, along with this, in front of the humanities in the conditions of a decisive battle for the German and European future

given a special task. While these sciences are decisively attracting all Germans to the spiritual front, they are also fighting to justify their own existence and justify new tasks... But there is no need for a special substantiation of tasks within the framework of a critical analysis of the forms of Western European civilization, its relationship to the German cultural idea. German studies cannot pass by this sphere of activity, since it must occupy a key position in it. Based on the German language entrusted to her and German poetry, she must develop and convey the comprehensible essence of the German. Of course, this cannot be done in the form of clear definitions, as the French liked to do in their time. However, it must be clear and definite, which we have lacked so far. We must see our own essence, which we can oppose to everything else, a world alien to us, which only strives to slander the Germans. It follows from the target setting itself that we are not talking about momentary propaganda work determined by the moment and the course of the war. It is about finding permanent and real values that will find their true power just after the end of the war, when new issues will appear on the cultural agenda. From the goals outlined very briefly, we can conclude that the development of the cultural and political image of National Socialism will be carried out ... This activity should be systematic, accessible and flawless from a methodological point of view. It must be strictly scientific, designed in strict accordance with the requirements of science,

provided with scientific equipment. It should not be some new form of reference or a rearrangement of existing material. The main question that is now put before German studies is: what is "German" in our time, what distinguishes our species? The natural prerequisite for answering this question is the possession of exceptional scientific material.

However, the Germanized "European idea" was not always perceived by the leadership of the Third Reich as exceptionally successful. An example is the work of Leo Weisgerber, a scientist who took part in three projects at once in the Department of the Military Use of the Humanities. In a report prepared in 1941, he wrote: "If we talk about actions related to the native language, then we can talk about four peak take-offs. These apogees are to some extent characterized by the designation of the language. First, the German language appeared, then the native speech, and then we can talk about the most ancient dominant speech and the language of the heroes.

Something similar was expressed by Georg Schmidt-Rohr, whose developments we will devote a separate chapter to. In the meantime, we note that Schmidt-Rohr planned not just to promote the spread of the German language (which is actually a great many organizations to this day), but to provoke the decomposition of other European languages. Long before the Nazis came to power, he set himself specific tasks. For example, "linguo-political fragmentation of the Russian Empire"; "creation of special literary languages" for Ukraine and the Baltic States, which in the future should have made it difficult to communicate with native Russian speakers; "decomposition of linguistic consciousness" among the opponents of Germany; "the creation of special German dialects", which should contribute to the destruction of the national identity of a number of European peoples.

Looking ahead, it should be noted that in some cases the language policy in the occupied territories was extremely rigid. If during the years of the Weimar Republic the requirements of the German Language Union were extremely moderate, then with the outbreak of the war, completely different requests turned out to be in demand. The board of the union included not only Schmidt-Rohr and Weisgerber, but also Eduard Engel. This specialist in lexicography contributed to the implementation of the policy of "dewallonianization" in the territory of Alsace occupied in 1940. At first, it was planned to eliminate from everyday and official communication any French words that were considered as "foreign

tel." Then the measures of influence became more radical. The population of Alsace was supposed to burn all books in French, for which a special ritual was organized in 1941, held during the summer solstice. If someone after that ventured to speak French or was seen with a French book in his hands, then he immediately went to a concentration camp located near Shirmek.

There are documents, letters and statements that in many cases are trying to bypass. So, for example, it happened with the so-called. Hitler's "European speech". It is actually not mentioned not only in connection with the development of plans for the "European Union", but also in connection with the foreign policy of the Third Reich as a whole. The reason for this, most likely, lies in the fact that this speech in its main points did not quite coincide with Hitler's ideas about politics, which he once outlined in Mein Kampf. But at the same time, Hitler's "European speech" was published at one time, and is contained in reference materials. But at the same time, in the indexes, which, as it were, determine its essence and the content of the main provisions, the word "Europe" does not appear anywhere. At the same time, all this speech is the clearest document testifying to the impending collapse of the Third Reich.

By and large, Hitler's "European program" during the war did not start from scratch. The outline for it was voiced in 1936, when German troops entered the Rhine demilitarized zone. In those days, many politicians started talking about the creation of a "System for ensuring peace in Europe." Most of all, this issue was discussed in France, which could take retaliatory steps against Germany. Hitler was well aware that in this case the position of Germany would be extremely difficult - the state of the armed forces did not allow participation in noticeable military conflicts, since the rearmament program was just beginning. Accordingly, Hitler at all costs needed to prevent the folding of the "pan-European security system", this could only be done by seizing the initiative. In this situation, he made a number of statements that in the long run were only tactical in nature.

1. The German Imperial Government announces its readiness to enter into negotiations with France and Belgium on the creation of a mutual demilitarized zone
2. The Imperial Government of Germany proposes to conclude a non-aggression pact between Germany, France and Belgium for a period of 25 years, which
should become a guarantee of the inviolability of borders in the West
3. The German Imperial Government invites England and Italy to sign this treaty as Guaranteeing Powers.
4. The Imperial Government of Germany will agree if the [Royal] Government of the Netherlands regrets acceding to this treaty.
5. The German Imperial Government is ready for the subsequent expansion of this system of security based on treaties between the Western Powers, and proposes the conclusion of an "air pact", which is aimed at averting the threat of surprise raids.
6. The German Imperial Government proposes to conclude similar non-aggression pacts in the East with all states that, like Poland, border Germany.
7. After Germany has achieved final equality and the restoration of full sovereignty over the entire German imperial region, the German Imperial Government considers that the main reason for Germany's withdrawal from the "League of Nations" has been eliminated. For this reason, she is again ready to join the "League of Nations".

The speech delivered by Hitler in 1941 was largely a reaction to the US entry into the war as part of the anti-Hitler coalition. The very fact of delivering this speech indicated that Hitler nevertheless understood (although perhaps not quite clearly and completely) that Europe occupied by the Reich could hardly be ruled for a long time, based only on the concepts of "German superiority". The Reich for the first time, although not in the most distinct way, demonstrated the need for the support of the peoples of the countries it occupied. The occupation authorities, as well as the authorities of the Reich, needed to attract intellectuals to their side. A propaganda combination was used - Americanization and Bolshevization threatened the European identity, which the Third Reich allegedly defended. in different

variations on this propaganda ruse continued until 1945. In a speech addressed to the Reichstag in 1942, Hitler declared: "Just as the Greeks once fought against the Persians, not for Greece, the Romans against the Carthaginians - not for Rome, the Romans and Germans against the Huns - not for the West, the Germans the emperors against the Mongols are by no means for Germany, the Spanish heroes against the Africans are not for Spain. They defended Europe as a whole. In a similar way, Germany is now fighting not for itself, but for our entire continent ... If Italy, Spain, Croatia had not sent their divisions, then a European defensive front could not have arisen, which has considerable strength

influence on other peoples, telling them about the New Europe. Hearing this prophetic call, volunteers arrive from Northern and Western Europe: Norwegians, Danes, Dutch, Flemings, Belgians and even French. They are transforming the struggle of the Allied Axis Powers in the literal sense of the word into a pan-European crusade."

We must immediately make a reservation - this kind of rhetoric did not mean at all that Hitler decided to abandon his inherent Germanocentrism. In the circle of his close associates, he spoke completely different, often directly opposite to what was presented to the public. However, hardly any of the "mere mortals" could question Hitler's words, which were uttered from the high rostrum of the Reichstag. Words about a "New Europe" and a "pan-European crusade" were taken very seriously. Surrounded by Rosenberg, a kind of jubilation reigned at all. Close to the main Nazi ideologue, a representative of big business and a specialist in the field of economic theory, Werner Deitz, spoke in all frankness about a "Europe of countries with equal rights." He believed that the Nazi leadership had changed course, and therefore it was possible to return to ideas that had been developed many years ago. However, although Alfred Rosenberg himself supported Deitz, he did not at all share his optimism.

Heinrich Himmler, the head of the SS, was probably the most dodgy politician of the Third Reich. He gradually rose to the pinnacle of power, transforming the auxiliary branch of the Nazi party first into a powerful organization, and then into a uniform "state within a state." But even he did not immediately appreciate the political possibilities that the "European idea" gave. The first attempts to influence the language policy in terms of the "unification" of the European space were made by Himmler immediately after the outbreak of World War II. It was then that the researchers controlled by him tried to prove the "Jewish origin" of the traditional German Gothic font. It was at the suggestion of the Reichsführer SS that Hitler decided to abandon the official use of the Gothic font, replacing it with ordinary serif letters. In fact, the ethnic origin of the Gothic type was used as a pretext for the unification of printing and printing activities in the European space - in this case, the rejection of fancy letters contributed to the uniformity of propaganda in the occupied territories.

If we talk about the specific benefits of using

"European idea", then its prospects were evaluated in the SD, the SS security service, which simultaneously performed the functions of intelligence and counterintelligence. It was the employees of the SD, together with the specialists of the Documentation Society, who took up the compilation of a bibliography on the "European problem". This project was supervised by Alfred Sieks, head of the UP department of the RSHA, who, among other things, was an envoy of the 1st class in the Imperial Foreign Office. This high-ranking SS officer (since 1945 SS Brigadeführer) was essentially an academic researcher. It is no coincidence that in the RSHA he was responsible for the study of worldview issues, and in the Foreign Ministry he headed the cultural and political department. Among other things, Alfred Sieks was the dean of the Foreign Faculty at Friedrich Wilhelm University (Berlin). By rallying young and ambitious intellectuals around him, he was to create a hybrid of the "imperial idea", the "European idea" and the "idea of German identity". It was Alfred Sicks who suggested revising the content of the traditional German concept of "Reich". In 1943, he wrote: "The concept of "empire" must be forgotten reserved for the united Empire of all Germanic tribes and peoples. In relation to Germany, the term "German Reich" should be used.

In his activities, Alfred Ziks often collaborated with specialists from the SS research society "Heritage of the Ancestors" (Ahnenerbe). The scientific curator of the Heritage of Ancestors, Professor Walter Wüst paid much attention to the formation of generalized principles of Indo-European culture. It is doubly surprising that the Ahnenerbe began to study the "European idea" quite late - when the research society in the status of department "A" was integrated into the personal headquarters of the Reichsfuehrer SS. It is significant that at the meeting of the special department of the "Heritage of the Ancestors", which was called "German Scientific Action", held on January 9, 1944 in Salzburg, the organizational head of the Anenerbe, SS Standartenführer Wolfram Sievers, noted: "Today we talk too much about Europe, and almost do not discuss German idea. Some of the researchers believe that the detachment of the Heritage of Ancestors leadership from the development of the "European idea" was caused to a large extent by subjective factors. In any case, Heritage of the Ancestors had its own tools for shaping the vision of a "New Europe". In particular, it was the above-mentioned department of "German scientific action", the head of which Hans Schneider was in almost constant contact with Alexander Dolezalek. Exactly

Dolezalek convinced Schneider of the exceptional importance of the "European question". This is evidenced by a document prepared by Schneider in March 1945. In particular, it said: "People's leadership requires obvious scientific documents and descriptions that would allow one to look at European reality, which determine its forces. First of all, from all this I would like to highlight several thematic groups:

1. The racial idea in the German folk way of life and the new European order. This block also includes questions: the problems and significance of German racial thought, its impact on discussions regarding the transformation of this part of the world. Clarifications and a scientific racial lexicon are required. It is necessary to shed light on the question of the relationship between people and race. How did the ruling strata of Europe actually react to the German racial idea?
2. The concept and reality of the European living space. German views in ideas and politics. Intellectual and political manifestations among other European peoples (especially in France, Italy and England). The actual impact of German ideas about order on European peoples and ruling classes.
3. Spiritual situation in European countries. Really important for the ruling strata of the European peoples are ideological images about the essence, structure and prospects of the political worldview.
4. The essence, participation and actual significance of the German influence on the formation of the European Commonwealth of Nations. What is the German influence? Is it just a historical moment, or is it a specific force of influence on the being and consciousness of the European peoples? How can one perfectly convey the essence of this influence from a scientific point of view? Basic German values (for example, loyalty, honor, freedom, etc.) in the consciousness and life of the German people and other European peoples. To what extent are these values comprehensible at the moment?
5. German organizational aspirations and mistakes made in the occupied territories (especially note the report of SS Hauptsturmführer Professor Franz).
6. Special attitude of Europe towards Asia and America".

The further fate of this theoretician of the "European Union" from the SS is very indicative and in many respects resembles the fate of Alexander Dolezalek, who was also involved in the development of the "European idea". In May 1945, Schneider faked his own death and even corrected on

this is the appropriate death certificate. For himself, he obtained forged documents in the name of Hans Schwerte. Most likely, not without the participation of Western intelligence services, he moved to the British zone of occupation. There he quite freely remarried his own wife, after

which began to lead a not particularly secretive life. "Hans Schwerte" rewrote his dissertation and received a degree, after which he first headed the department of German studies at the University of Aachen. Schneider (Schwerte) was so sure of his own impunity that he even decided to take the post of rector of the local polytechnic institute. Of course, such behavior was predetermined not so much by recklessness or courage, but by guarantees received from the Western powers. Like Dolezalek, Schneider, from the beginning of the 1950s, took an active part in the development of measures for the practical implementation of the "European idea", which eventually resulted in the process of European integration and the creation of the European Union as we know it. Another SS officer was involved in this project. It was about the head of the culture department in the SD, SS Standartenführer Wilhelm Spengler. Through joint efforts, Spengler and Schneider (Schwert) published a whole series of books devoted to the problems of folding a single European space. In many cases, it was about slightly modified developments that were made during the years of the National Socialist dictatorship. In any case, the Shtalling publishing house was considered one of the ideological centers of modern European integration, as well as educational projects that were supervised by another SS officer, Alexander Dolezalek.

Chapter 13

Napoleon's empire to Hitler's Reich

On March 4, 1944, a closed conference was held in one of the Paris hotels, to which a special guest from Germany was invited. It was Werner Deitz, who by that time had already gained fame as a leading specialist in the field of alleged European integration. At this event, Deitz made a presentation entitled "Napoleon's Continental Policy as a Forerunner of the Reich's European Policy." The topic for discussion was not chosen by chance. French collaborators and some of the representatives of the power structures of the Third Reich believed that the folding of a single European space was an inevitable prerequisite for eliminating the long-standing rivalry between France and Germany. Deitz's report made a great impression on the supporters of the Vichy regime. For this reason, his texts were reproduced in the April issue of the Collaboration magazine.

Speaking to the French, Werner Deitz tried to present in his report a historical justification for the principles of autarky, which he considered necessary for the formation of a "single European economic space." He proceeded from the fact that any refusal to preserve the natural living space led to the inevitable degeneration of the peoples, who, as it were, were deprived of their natural vital basis. The situation changed in the 17th century, when the "epoch of great geographical discoveries" began, which led to a radical change in the world order of all human races. According to Deitz, such a redrawing of the way of life led to the emergence of two large spaces that began to be actively used by Jewish capital. In the West it was the Anglo-American space (USA and North America), in the East it was the Eurasian space (Russia). In the Western sphere, natural development, according to the speaker, was hindered by the policy pursued by Britain. Werner Deitz proclaimed Napoleon the first statesman who attempted to "return Europe's political and economic independence." At the same time, it was noted that Napoleon used an insufficient set of means to achieve

this goal. But on the other hand, it was Napoleon who made an attempt, on the one hand, to organize a continental blockade of England, on the other hand, in every possible way contributed to the formation of a "union of European states." "This great political idea, of course, was based only on the concept of the state as such and the fact of recognizing individual states, but by no means on the biological essence of the peoples who founded them. He [Napoleon] wanted to sacrifice the sovereign right of peoples in the name of the sovereignty of the dynastic state." Deitz noted that Napoleon was obsessed with the "imperialist concept of space," which aroused instinctive rejection among many European peoples. "He did not plan to create a true European living space, but only intended to dominate the expanses of the European continent."

Werner Deitz considered Napoleon's gigantic mistake not that he started a war against Russia, but that he started a war without enlisting political support in some Russian circles (in today's language, he did not form a "fifth column"). Werner Deitz did not dare to draw obvious parallels between Napoleon and Hitler ("one can hardly compare the continental policy of Napoleon and the European policy of the Fuhrer"), but nevertheless proclaimed the French emperor and commander "the forerunner and prophet of the modern renaissance of our part of the world." According to Deitz, it was Napoleon who took the first step towards starting to form the "European idea". Deitz stated: "Napoleon's France and Adolf Hitler's Germany made European politics their destiny. Germany, in alliance with France, must complete the work begun by Napoleon. And it depends only on France whether it is ready for this. Napoleonic politics was a childhood disease during the great process of European reconstitution."

According to Deitz, during the First World War, General Ludendorff undertook a similar undertaking, but "like Napoleon, he stopped halfway through." As we can see, the aggression and enslavement of Russia was considered by theorists of the "European idea" almost as a natural prerequisite for the formation of a "single European living space". Werner Deitz did not even hide it. Speaking of General Ludendorff, he emphasized: "For all that, he did not make the gravest mistake of Napoleon and opposed Russia using the most powerful political means. He launched Lenin and Trotsky into Russia, which hastened its downfall." Deitz is by no means

was ready to recognize Bolshevism as an instrument of German politics, and therefore immediately made the necessary reservation: "Ludendorff's plans to stifle Bolshevism, which was gaining strength in a timely manner, failed, moreover, the commander himself experienced a failure, since an extremely effective Anglo-American blockade was organized against Germany. The triumphant Bolshevism placed the inclusion of Eastern Europe in the family of European peoples.

Unable to openly compare Hitler and Napoleon, Deitz claimed that the Fuhrer was avoiding the mistakes of his predecessors. It is quite significant that if in the issue of "preventing the Anglo-American threat" Deitz focused exclusively on economic and economic issues, while discussing the "problem of the eastern territories", he found logical its "military-political solution". "The Russian space since the revolution has been exerting influence due to its agrarian structure, as well as due to the restoration of private property, which allows them [the Bolsheviks] to mobilize in the ranks of the people and national forces. They are still trying to put themselves at the head of these revolutionary popular forces. But they will fail because of the changed state of affairs." Since Werner Deitz made this speech in the spring of 1944, the position of Germany on the fronts was not yet completely catastrophic. This explains the passages about the fact that "in the East they see how victoriously the idea of the Fuhrer marches." For this reason, statements about "the creation of a New Europe with the right of every people to realize its national character within the family of European peoples" look like outright geopolitical speculation, rather than a sad anecdote.

In any case, Werner Deitz was aware that in order to win in the East, it was urgently necessary to provoke the collapse of the USSR. "Like the sorcerer's apprentice in the works of Goethe, Stalin will also become the spirit he invoked and will not be able to free himself. At the same time, the inorganically formed space of Eastern Europe and Central Asia will begin to disintegrate, after which it will bury itself."

The outlook for the United States is quite remarkable. Deitz assumed that America would also undergo a significant transformation. He stated: "The course of the war will also force Roosevelt to introduce into America everything that he had previously overcome and characterized as "Nazism". From now on, America will behave like Great Europe and Great Asia - in its own space and with its own forces, anti-imperialist aspirations will be encouraged.

restored past [geopolitical] state inherent in the year 1500. Deitz believed that the opponents of the Third Reich would actively use the ideas of National Socialism. The following quote clearly indicates that this ideological inspirer of the "European Union" did not quite accurately understand what National Socialism really was and how Nazism was perceived by other peoples in 1944. "In any case, Stalin, for his part, will try to carry out a regional re-planning of Eastern Europe, on the one hand, resorting to the National Socialist idea of the right of peoples to free national development, on the other hand, opposing the National Socialism that gave birth to this idea. Similarly, Roosevelt will try to strike at Europe, being forced to adopt the economic ideas of National Socialism. However, natural laws will come into force, and both of them will inevitably collapse, buried under the weight of internal contradictions.

Drawing a link between Napoleon's empire and Hitler's Reich, Werner Deitz, in the speculative manner characteristic of many Nazi propagandists, spoke of three basic principles that would form the basis of the "family of European peoples." It is highly revealing that the very same words are still being used by EU officials in Brussels. What were these imaginary principles:

- preservation of the national honor of all peoples;

e the right and duty of the European peoples to exercise the mutual preservation of political, economic and cultural privileges;

e the right and duty to protect their common European living space.

It was supposed that after the speech in Paris, Werner Deitz would publish the book "Revival of Europe through Eurosociism. European Charter". If we talk about the report itself, then, according to eyewitnesses, the attitude of the French towards it was highly ambiguous. Although, without a doubt, this was a clear nod to the French collaborators. Many were confused by the predictions that concerned Stalin and Roosevelt, since such statements differed from the clichés used by Nazi propaganda. Bernhard Payr, special commissioner of the Rosenberg department, who was present at the reading of the report, noted: "Optimism in these matters is quite acceptable. I believe that there is nothing dangerous in working with formulations that are just

expression of a well-calculated theory and they do not need to be brought into line with reality literally tomorrow.

Despite the fact that Werner Deitz can be considered one of the central developers of the idea of a "European Union", nevertheless, his individual theses could seem like "fantasies on the topic" if they were not duplicated in the documents of other departments. This is fully true in relation to the ideological construction: "Napoleon's continental policy is the forerunner of Hitler's European policy." These constructions were used not only in the department of Rosenberg, to which Werner Deitz actually belonged, but also in individual units of the SS. And this cannot be a coincidence. Among archival documents stored in the Federal Archives of Germany, one can find the text of an unpublished textbook written by SS employees. On the cover, the name of an unknown doctor Ludman appears as the author. However, the conducted textual examination allowed us to assume that the actual author of the first textbook on the history of the "European Union" was the head of the educational department of the SS Main Directorate, Standartenführer Karl Dambach. Within the framework of this section, we are primarily interested in the perception of the figure of Napoleon and how he was correlated with Hitler.

Karl Dambach proceeded from the fact that the birth of Europe as such occurred in the days of Hellenism. "For a European, Greek culture in its essence, in the spirit of a free individual, is still alive." The Roman Empire was interpreted as the first attempt to unite Europe on a state

level. The impulse received passed through the centuries and was accepted by Napoleon. The Holy Roman Empire of the German peoples in the Middle Ages became the "center of the Christian West." Then Europe was united in the ideas of the Renaissance and Enlightenment, which in a peculiar manner were perceived by Bonaparte, who, in the name of maintaining the "continental balance of power", made a violent attempt to unite Europe.

In an attempt to justify the desire for European unification that could be observed over the centuries, the authors of the textbook from the SS headquarters stated: at the same time, life aspirations that have always been relevant for Europe. However, no one will deny that their effectiveness lies not in abstract ideas, frozen forms, decrepit treasures of our spirit, but precisely in the power

which shapes our lives and our destiny, in the highest sense of the word. If Europe denied it, then it would do it for itself."

In an attempt to justify the continental claims of Napoleon, a rather complex historical scheme was built. In particular, it was said: "At the moment, the heritage of Greece is mainly the heritage of its spirit. Political unification was not carried out by the Greeks themselves, although the desire for this as a true historical force was undoubtedly present among them. With blood and iron, the Great Alexander of Macedon rallied the Hellenes as one people in order to start a war under his command. However, he saw a world empire as the ultimate goal... It was not the domination of Europe over Asia, but the unification of both parts of the world under the common cover of world culture generated by the Greek spirit. We know that this world empire collapsed immediately after the early death of its inhumanly great creator. We also know that the idea of a world empire, which came from the East, again and again ignited the soul of people of European blood. Not only Caesar, but also Napoleon dreamed of following in the footsteps of Alexander the Great to India.

The substantiation of the ideological and ideological prerequisites, which, as it were, provoked the "continental policy of Napoleon", was also given. In the 18th century, rationalistic views prevailed in the European environment, which was one of the manifestations of the Enlightenment. "However, rationalism as a doctrine brought political benefits only to England, where this idea itself was born, developed and began to be consistently applied in the interests of Great Britain." In fact, the rationalistic principle of "balance" preached by England was directed against France, which was striving for hegemony in Europe. This confrontation reached its climax at the beginning of the 19th century, that is, during the Napoleonic wars. In this confrontation, the authors of the textbook clearly opposed British rationalism: "Today we understand, as clearly and distinctly as the politicians of Great Britain 150 years ago, that the idea of equilibrium was just a tool used by a world power to ensure control over Europe." Moreover, the hegemony of Napoleonic France was presented almost as a positive phenomenon, primarily for Germany. "The German romantics Schlegel and Tieck gave Germany not only the English Shakespeare, the Spanish Calderon and Cervantes, the Italian Dante. They and their relatives

spirit figures during the Napoleonic hegemony made Germany the intellectual center of the European peoples. Again, Napoleon acted as the unwitting initiator of the awakening of the German national consciousness, when wide public circles opposed foreign domination.

Be that as it may, but experts from the main department of the SS in their textbook proclaimed Napoleon Bonaparte "a symbol of European destiny." He was portrayed by them as a hostage to the struggle between creative and destructive political forces. "In his truly titanic great figure, the whole tragic fate of Europe was concisely reflected, capturing even our days. It is precisely today that Napoleon should be recognized by us as a warning symbol for Europe. Only today, and only from a pan-European point of view, can his political motives, his political merits and his political legacy be assessed in general. When Oswald

Spengler in his "The Decline of the West" H) saw in Napoleon a new phenomenon of Caesar, who, through the creation of a new empire, was supposed to prevent the collapse of Europe as a cultural space, then he, no doubt, had good historical and philosophical grounds for this. It must be said right away that Spengler himself was very skeptical that the National Socialists had distorted his historical and philosophical constructions, fitting them to their own party needs.

SS theorists were literally a couple of steps away from proclaiming Napoleon Bonaparte "a prophet and vanguard for the New Europe." With some sadistic pleasure, the authors of the textbook stated that "the millions of dead Europeans who fell on the battlefields of the Napoleonic wars were victims offered on the altar of Europe." However, as if recollecting himself, the same specialists from the SS headquarters made the reservation: "However, at the same time, we must admit the bitter truth - that sacrifice did not restore the unity of Europe." That is, they proceeded from the hypocritical principle that "the end justifies the means," and if Russia had been defeated in 1812, then the death of millions of people would not have been in vain. In this case, it was believed that Napoleon merely "revived" the legacy of the Roman Empire, not in the name of Europe, but in the name of securing his own dominance through Europe. "Napoleon was an imperialist, the first great imperialist in the history of modern Europe." And further: "The son of the revolution of 1789, he denied the slogan of freedom, but recognized only the equality of subjects before

imperial laws. He was unable to give meaning to ideas and convey them with troops that extended all the way to Russia. He was not able to understand the traditions of the authorities of old Europe and their logic. He did not abandon Caesarism in favor of the total state." In this case, Napoleon was condemned not for his wars of conquest, but precisely for inconsistency in the conduct of these wars, for refusing to back up military operations with political maneuvers. Despite all this, the SS ideologists clearly intended to turn Napoleon into a kind of forerunner of Hitler. "We cannot forget the fatal mistakes and their great significance for the development of the entire continent as a whole. Consequences that happened against his [Napoleon's] own intention. First of all, the people's spirit raised by force from the depths of Germany, which paved the way for the "Little German" unification carried out by Bismarck. The consequences, which turned out to be directed against his own plans, did not lead to the elimination of German fragmentation.

Since the text of the textbook was prepared in 1945, its authors could not ignore the actual position of Germany on the fronts. Only this can explain the statements that, even having lost to the Russian army, Napoleon in the end still "won victory" over Russia. Like, as a result, the Russian Empire fell into a century-old crisis, which ended with its collapse in 1917. In this case, the authors of the SS textbook somehow forgot to report that in 1918 the Kaiser empire collapsed, which was just a product of Bismarck, who in turn was proclaimed almost an unwitting disciple of Napoleon.

Chapter 14

When such facts become public, journalists usually begin to question colleagues and neighbors, who, in turn, groan and mutter in fright: "Who would have thought, but he seemed to us such a decent person." Indeed, Hans Schwerte seemed to be the very respectability and symbol of German decorum. Professor of German studies, from April 1965 he worked at the Aachen Polytechnic Institute. Since that time, he has been an employee in the bureaucracy of North Rhine-Westphalia. For three years he was the rector of the institute, which, by his own admission, "became his second home." In early 1974, Schwerte became Minister of Science in North Rhine-Westphalia, responsible, among other things, for scientific contacts with representatives of the kingdoms of the Netherlands and Belgium. In 1978, Hans Schwerte retired. He was an almost impeccable representative of German science - he was made an honorary member of the Senate of the University of Aachen, in December 1983 - a professor of the latest German literature at the University of Salzburg, in 1985 he became a Knight of the Order of the Belgian Crown.

Everything would be fine, but since the end of the 80s, rumors have spread around Aachen that the professor led a double life. Initially, there were suspicions that Hans Schwerte was actually called by a different name. Then a version arose that in the past he was an SS officer. This peculiar campaign reached its apogee by 1993-1994. Everything was resolved on April 28, 1995, when a group of Dutch journalists in the program "Brandpunt" ("Focus") presented irrefutable evidence that Hans Schwerte in his "past life" was indeed an SS officer. And not just an SS officer, but a member of the personal staff of the Reichsfuehrer SS, a high-ranking employee of the "Ancestral Heritage" Hauptsturmfuehrer Hans Schneider. And what an evil irony of fate! The venerable professor, who was in charge of scientific contacts with the Netherlands, at one time "worked" in the occupied Dutch territories. The main accusation against him basically boiled down to the fact that it was Hans Schneider who participated in sending medical equipment from the University of Leiden to the Dachau camp, where inhuman experiments were carried out on prisoners. All these facts surfaced utterly "at the wrong time", in Germany they were preparing to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II, and in

The University of Aachen was expecting the arrival of Dutch professors. You don't have to be a prophet to guess that relations between the land of North Rhine-Westphalia and Holland have cooled sharply.

However, there was no big scandal. Apparently, Schwerte-Schneider had high-ranking patrons who reported about the upcoming exposure. Only this can explain the fact that literally on the eve of the television program going on the air, Schwerte-Schneider "came to confession." As a result, instead of meaningful questions, the Dutch television program ended with the announcement of a fax sent by the German politician Johannes Rau (then not yet the president of the FRG). In the 1970s, Rau was the prime minister of North Rhine Westphalia, and it was to him that Hans Schwerte, who for several years served as minister of science in this land, owed his political rise. Rau's letter said in part: "Now that I have learned that Professor Schwerte has changed his identity and concealed his real name, both as a person and as a former prime minister, I feel extremely confused and deceived ... I am ashamed, that someone who had once been in the occupied Netherlands as an SS officer was appointed by me in 1974 to be in charge of contacts with Holland and Belgium. I can only ask for forgiveness for such reprehensible acts." Similar apologies were made by Anke Brunn, who held the post of Minister of Science of North Rhine-Westphalia at the time of the exposure. To do this, she had to invite the Consul General of the Netherlands. A little later, she repeated all the same apologies, but already at the Dutch-German symposium, which took place on May 8, 1995 in Aachen.

Before considering the case of Schwerte-Schneider in the context of developing the idea of a "united Europe", I would like to say a few words about how an SS officer turned into a citizen without a criminal past. Who was Schwerte-Schneider?

His second life began in the ruins of post-war Germany, which he crossed on the most ordinary bicycle. There were 3,000 marks in his bag, and he diligently pretended to be a liberated "prisoner of war". His patrons took pains to create an alibi for him. The documents left in the elite suburb of Berlin - Dahlem, indicated - SS Hauptsturmfuehrer Hans Schneider died on April 26, 1945. Nobody knew the details of his death, but they actually were useless - at the end of the war, people died and disappeared by the thousands. And Schneider, staying alive, said goodbye to his

past life.

Hans Zrnst Schneider was born on December 15, 1909 in Königsberg. After receiving a matriculation certificate, in 1928 he continued his studies at the university of his native city. Among the subjects he studied were: the history of German literature, the history of art, theater studies, philosophy, ethnography and ancient history. For several semesters he studied at the universities of Berlin and Vienna. In June 1935, he passed his Ph.D. exams and began work on his dissertation.

In addition to science, Hans Schneider was quite active in the socio-political sphere. For example, in the spring and summer of 1933, he took part in the "Voluntary Labor Service", after which he joined the SA - the assault squads of the Nazi Party. On May 1, 1937, he became a member of the NSDAP and at the same time joined the SS. His career could be called, if not swift, then successful in its own way. On June 21, 1939, he received the rank of SS-Untersturmführer, on January 30, 1941 he became SS Obersturmführer, and on January 30, 1943, Hauptsturmführer. On the eve of his "death" he was introduced to the rank of SS Sturmbannführer. At the same time, Hans Schneider played an important role in the activities of the SS research society "Heritage of the Ancestors". "Reborn" in the guise of Hans Schwerte, the former SS officer spent some time in Lübeck, with forged documents of a German soldier allegedly released from English captivity.

It hardly makes sense to talk about all the activities of Hans Schneider - we are primarily interested in one episode, which, in a strange way, dragged on for many decades in life. To do this, we need to travel back to the summer months of 1943. On July 12, 1943, Wolfram Sievers, the organizational head of the Heritage of Ancestors, wrote in the service log: "15:00-16:30. Report to the Reichsfuehrer SS. I received an order to start resettling the Heritage of Ancestors." A month later, Sievers wrote in the same magazine: "Packing and shipping from Berlin secret files, current working materials. Departure for Weishenfeld. Wolfram Sievers, as the formal head of the Ancestral Heritage, left Berlin, which was under constant bombardment, and, together with the Ahnenerbe archives and the most valuable employees, went to Weischenfeld (Upper Franconia), where the Ancestral Heritage auxiliary camp was located. It was from there that he planned to carry out the organizational management of the Heritage of Ancestors. By and large, the Ahnenerbe was essentially

decentralized organization.

However, Hans Schneider remained in Berlin and continued to work at the Ancestral Heritage headquarters. He had about 30 employees at his disposal, more than half of whom were women (six of them were on vacation, and two more appeared "from time to time"). Such behavior of Schneider might seem strange. Already being exposed, in the mid-90s, he said in an interview: "I wanted to correct what I had done." The phrase is very significant, but from it alone, especially taken out of context, it is difficult to say what Schwerte-Schneider meant after all.

The answer to this question can be found in the docs. On March 1, 1945, Schneider, who had previously been in charge of the work of the "German Scientific Action" department, received the task from the Reich Security Office to develop the theme "European Organizing Ideas". In fact, it was about another aspect of the formation of the "European Union". Schneider had to give clarifications on a number of points. In particular, various options for a "peace settlement", the rationale for "the economic need for closer European cooperation," etc. All the documents clearly read that the planning was for the future, and the projects were by no means planned to be implemented in the conditions of the military defeat of Germany. Even such moments were taken into account: was it worth including Great Britain in the "single European space" or not? It has been emphasized more than once that the Anglo-German rapprochement was the most important moment in the post-war structure of Europe, but at the same time, the proposed developments should have been devoid of "overly accentuated Anglophilia" (that's what it said in the document!) Taking into account the fact that the USSR was automatically excluded from the project "United Europe", it can be assumed that the development of the "European idea", focused on the post-war period, according to the "good" tradition, was Russophobic and anti-Russian in nature.

All this could be considered crazy fantasies, if it were not for the inexorable force of the fact. After the war, the propaganda of the ideas of European integration was carried out by those who developed these ideas during the years of the Nazi dictatorship. The liberal-democratic version of the sudden launch of European integration processes as an involuntary response to the horrors of war does not stand up to criticism: everything went according to a long-established scenario, although with a significant shift in some ideological accents.

Take, for example, the work of the Shtalling publishing house, in which, in a strange way, both SS officers from the SD, who had served a rather suspended sentence, and completely "resurrected" persons like Schwerte-Schneider, found refuge. All of them strongly dissociated themselves from National Socialism and right-wing radicals, and Schwerte-Schneider actively preached left-liberal ideas. They did not seem to be hiding, but they did not seem to pay much attention to their past. The propagandists of the "European idea" not only kept their distance, but categorically denied even the very possibility of communicating with post-war Eurofascists. They seemed to be afraid of their own plans being exposed, or some hidden scheme. Meanwhile, many of the former National Socialists viewed the collapse of the Third Reich as merely a transition to "Europe." For example, in 1951, Arthur Ehrhardt began publishing the magazine Nation-Europe. Monthly in the service of European renewal. The following ideas developed on the pages of this right-wing publication: Hitler fought for the unity of Europe, the initiative for the unification of Europe came from the head of the imperial press department, Otto Dietrich. As expected, the pages of the "Nation-Europe" published the memories of numerous "European volunteers", as a rule, those who fought against the USSR as part of the Waffen-SS. However, in the publishing house "Stalling" everything was exactly the opposite.

In fact, the main European project of the Shtalling publishing house was the book series The Creators of Our Time. In total, it published four volumes: two of them were devoted to thinkers and writers, and two more to scientists and researchers. As a result, virtually all the more or less noticeable personalities of Europe were enlisted as supporters of integration. Their enumeration can take a long time, but there is hardly any need for this. It is only necessary to note an interesting coincidence. In a biographical article dedicated to the work of the brilliant and at the same time very controversial German poet Gottfried Benn, Hans "Schwerte" allowed himself a number of passages that actually point to his semi-legal position. "Double life, ambiguity - this is the main meaning of such an existence ... The mockingbird of history and at the same time its enchanted contemplator. The gray military uniform has become the mask of our time ("the army is a noble form of emigration"), but has not ceased to be a heritage of tradition. Duality links man and creation, image and phrase.

When the whole world celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Victory over Nazi Germany,

the unmasked ssss officer, smiling embarrassedly, gave an interview - he did not make excuses and did not repent, he only promised reporters that he would return the awards that he received from the governments of various countries as Professor Hans Schwerte.

Chapter 15

He died exactly 56 years after the Third Reich attacked the USSR - June 22, 1997 - and was buried in Munich, which was no longer the capital of the Nazi Party, nor the capital of German art, but just a city where they love beer and hold Oktoberfest. However, Hans Rössner did not worry about such losses. He did not like to show a true attitude to things at all. Over the years, he bowed to a work colleague: "Good morning, Herr Schwerte!" – although he knew perfectly well that Schwerte was Hans Schneider. Hans Rössner was himself an SS officer. Not that he particularly concealed this fact of his biography, but he preferred not to talk about it. As a result, when Rössner went to work at the Munich publishing house Piper, Hannah Arendt could not even think that her legendary work The Banality of Evil: Eichmann in Jerusalem was published not just by a former SS employee, but by a rather high-ranking SS officer.

There were probably many more, but history has preserved only a few names for us. Wilhelm Spengler, Hans Rössner and Hans Schneider are three high-ranking SS officers who, after the war, took up active propaganda of European integration ideas. During the years of the Nazi dictatorship they were engaged in the development of this topic, but in the 50s they did it with special meaning, fundamentally distancing themselves from the right-wing radicals, and at any opportunity demonstrating their liberalism. In general, there is a lot of mystery in their history. Take Hans Rössner, for example. Unlike Alexander Dolezalek and Hans Schneider, he failed to stage

own death and acquire a "new identity". He was arrested, but he did not stay in custody for long. On May 23, 1948, he was actually acquitted by a denazification court. At the trial, he, as a high-ranking officer of the SD, was present almost as a witness, but not as an accused. In his testimony, he tried to portray the SS security service as a "harmless organization", in which he was engaged only in the transfer of information. At the same time, Roessner emphasized in every possible way that he did not take part in any event related to the killings or the implementation of propaganda programs. The memory of this "witness" turned out to be very short - he tried to forget that with DM

there were special "operational groups" (Einsatzkommandos) that carried out punitive actions. As a result, on August 19, 1948, the court sentenced Hans Rössner to a fine of 2,000 marks, which was considered paid off. Based on the length of his stay in prison, Rössner, as it were, paid 20 marks a day. At large, he was just a "fellow traveler" of the Nazi regime. In fairness, it should be noted that during the denazification, people received real prison sentences and real monetary fines for much less offenses than work in the SD. In this regard, it was interesting to look at the career path of the "fellow traveler", who allegedly was not involved in propaganda work.

Hans Rössner was born on July 5, 1910 in the family of a Dresden public school teacher. After receiving his Abitur, he left for Leipzig to study philology and German history at the university there. Immediately make a reservation that many of his classmates later became employees of the SS departments. For example, if you look at the Imperial Security Main Office, you will find that Wilhelm Spengler and Heinz Graefe studied with Rössner. During his studies at the university, Rössner took an active part in public life - he was a member of the organization of mutual aid of students and "Academic Self-Help". In addition, he published his materials in the journal "People in the Making", which was published by Ernst Krik, who was one of the leading Nazi philosophers and was the actual creator of National Socialist pedagogy.

In November 1933, Hans Rössner joined the NSDAP storm troopers, but six months later he joined the SS. Here he begins to make his career - first he becomes a full-time referent, and then the head of one of the departments of the SD. In 1936, Rössner makes an unexpected decision - he formally leaves the service in the SS and goes to Bonn, where he becomes an assistant to Professor Carl Eustace Obenauer. It would seem that Hans Rössner gave preference to academic activities, sacrificing his career in the SS. However, such a judgment would be erroneous. Professor Obenauer was a veteran of the National Socialist Party and himself actively collaborated with the SD. Obviously, in this case, it was necessary to talk about the infiltration of SD employees into the academic environment. A similar version is confirmed by the documents found, in which Rössner himself (perhaps unwittingly) made a confession. In April 1938, he sent a letter to the Imperial Ministry of Science and Education, in which he reported

that he belonged to the number of "the most worthy representatives of our generation, which is responsible for the future of our higher educational institutions, especially considering that I am again ready to be recruited to the SS headquarters if we do not receive the necessary assistance at our university." By and large, Obenauer and Rössner made little secret of their "special" position. Both of them participated in the process of depriving Thomas Mann of the honorary doctorate of philosophy at the University of Bonn. On December 19, 1936, they sent a letter to Thomas Mann in which Obenauer, as dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, informed the disgraced writer that, after being deprived of that citizenship, he was forced to cross his name out of the list of honorable doctors.

In 1938, Hans Rössner defended his dissertation, which was devoted to the activities of Stefan George's circle. He published some of its provisions even before the defense, in particular on the pages of the Journal of German Education. The title of that article was highly revealing - "The Third Humanism in the Third Reich." And the content was no less politicized. Rössner was primarily critical of George's circle for its "spiritual

anticipation." At the same time, he emphasized that its creator, the poet and philosopher Stefan George, was "devoid of racial and spiritual instincts", which eventually led to the penetration of "representatives of urban educated Jewry" into his circle. As a result, Rössner proclaimed that George, as well as "the entire aesthetic-humanistic tradition" were "completely incompatible with national racial literary criticism", and therefore were subject to "eradication". In a similar vein, Rössner's articles "The Collapse of George's Circle" and "George and Ahasuerus or on the Spiritual Realm" were written. As you can see, a person who, after the war, declared his non-participation in the propaganda projects of the Third Reich, was nevertheless actively involved in them. For example, in 1938 Hans Rössner was among the drafters of a document called "The Status and Tasks of German Studies and German Literary Studies". This document provided a list of the names of fifty researchers who qualified as "opponents of National Socialism", as well as the names of eighteen researchers who were to be perceived as "impeccable from a political and ideological point of view." If Heydrich, chief of the SD, actively promoted "combat control", then Rössner considered himself one of the creators of "combat science".

In 1938, Hans Rössner returned to the service in the SS - he became the referent of department IV2 (assessment of spheres of life) of the main

management of the SD, where his work was supervised by Franz Sieks. Due to the fact that on September 27, 1939, the SS structures were reorganized, and the Main Directorate of Imperial Security was created, the Rössner department was merged into the management structure of the Sh S ("Culture"), for which Wilhelm Spengler was just responsible.

In 1939, in connection with the outbreak of war, Rössner was drafted into the army, but the SD quickly secured his return to his former duty station. From then until the collapse of the Reich, he served in the RSHA as an assistant for national culture and art. In 1944 he was promoted to the rank of Obersturmbannführer (SS Lieutenant Colonel). Signing the submission, Reichsführer SS Himmler expressed the wish that Rössner "take part in security police actions in the East." However, this "honorary trip", which subsequently led a number of his colleagues in the RSHA to the gallows, for some reason did not take place. The work of Hans Rössner in the Main Directorate of Imperial Security was awarded the most flattering marks. The authorities described him as "one of the most capable" employees, a "creative person" who was able to "develop the main National Socialist guidelines for his department so clearly and clearly that a number of decisions in the field of cultural work during the war were made on the basis of his proposals." The characteristics noted that "the ability and deep penetration of the National Socialist worldview" make Rössner, among other things, "a particularly sought-after speaker at party events."

One of his oratory "triumphs" was a report on the topic "Humanism and humanity" at a meeting of the Germanist Society in Hannover in May 1943. The Third Reich, Rössner prophesied, was again waging a "fateful struggle" against the West with its "Anglo-American humanistic ideology" and the East with its "extreme Bolshevik form of the same ideology." The question is being decided whether the beginnings that arose on a German basis will be able to be introduced into the spiritual structure of Europe, or the universalist ideas of the European cultural tradition will again lead to a fictitious pan-European consciousness... In April 1945, Rössner, together with the head of the Office Ohlendorf and a number of other employees, fled to Flensburg, where the so-called. Dönitz government. There he was arrested by the Americans in May 1945.

The question arises: where is the "crossover" bridge that led the SS officer from German studies to the "European project"? In fact, about Roessner's work as an SD officer on the project of the "European

Union" is known very little. However, evidence and documents have nevertheless been preserved that allow us to judge that his post-war appearance in the "pro-European" publishing house "Stalling" was by no means accidental. On November 29, 1942, an article appeared on the pages of the Reich magazine, the publication of which was personally supervised by Propaganda Minister Dr. Goebbels

Rössner, called "The Other Germany". In this material, its author wondered about the "fate of European culture." Rössner beered: "Today one can hear how fears are expressed that in the most monstrous of all wars, the forces of the Reich will be so concentrated in military, economic and technical efforts that there will no longer be energy for such abstract spheres of life as culture, spirit, soul and art. At the same time, our forces should not be unilaterally concentrated in only one of the directions. The longer the war that has engulfed the entire planet continues, the more real the threat becomes that all of Europe will follow this path. Who, then, will guarantee the preservation of European culture? Who will take care of her future?" Responding to this question, Rössner made a rather bold statement: "Probably, the course of the World War confirmed the correctness of those neutral cultural critics who warned many years ago against National Socialism following the path of one-sided military, " Prussian "dominance, when its vital energy and organizational possibilities could save Europe from Bolshevism, but were not able to give rise to a new form of European civilization and culture. In fact, this kind of journalistic moves were just a trick, a kind of game with the reader. In fact, Hans Rössner did not intend to criticize either the military policy or the (at that time) military superiority of the Third Reich. His task was different - he had to start the process of "humanizing" Germany, which at that historical moment primarily meant the Nazi regime. He urged not to be afraid that military victors would be pushed into the shadow of everyone else. It is obvious that some of the phrases were addressed to representatives of the occupied European territories: "We know from historical examples that the losers in the war became implicit winners in the spiritual sphere." In a continuous play of shadows and shades, Rössner seemed to lure the reader into the net of ideological traps: "No one will deny, and the soldier in the least degree, that war is inherently destructive, no one embellishes it. Also, no one argues with the fact that the war will mobilize all the forces of the Reich to a previously unseen extent. However

such a mobilization was presented by the author not as a negative for the spheres of European culture, but as a positive phenomenon in its own way. For this, a quote from Nietzsche was even used: "Write with blood and you will know that blood is spirit."

In his article, Hans Rössner spoke of "another Germany". On the one hand, the "other Germany" was opposed to "secret Germany" (this is how the hidden anti-fascist oppositionists and those who were simply secretly dissatisfied with the Nazi regime were usually called), and on the other hand, it had to differ from the ideas that prevailed in Europe about Germany as a "barbarian country". Rössner tried to remove the dilemma of choosing between humanism and barbarism, hinting that, having won, the Third Reich supposedly showed Europe the wonders of a flourishing culture. In particular, the article said: "They [Europeans] revere us as a people of thinkers and poets, but at the same time they secretly hope to deprive this people of political will. They admire Nietzsche as a "great European", but recognize the Prussian Bismarck and the empire he created. Finally, they are ready to accept the humanism of Thomas Mann with open arms, but at the same time they condemn the greatest German revolution. Rössner tried to form conditional principles according to which Europe sincerely accepted "another, misunderstood Germany", and thus, after the alleged military victory of the Third Reich, intra-European (primarily cultural) contradictions would be removed. It is not surprising that such views, after a slight transformation, were in demand in the post-war period. Replacing a couple of ideological clichés, the company of high-ranking SD officers continued to extol the "new Germany" (again "new") as the guardian of European culture. It is not surprising that all of them either received a "new personality", or, after all, when they found themselves in court, they were actually acquitted as a result, receiving a sentence as "unwitting fellow travelers of the criminal regime."

If we talk about the mysteriously missing specialists who were engaged in the development of the "European project" in the bowels of the Third Reich, then one cannot but pay attention to the fact that, like Dolezalek and Schneider, Werner Deitz and Georg Schmidt-Rohr were strangely listed among the dead. No one saw them die, no bodies were found, in all cases it was assumed that they died during the fighting conducted by the units

Volkssturm. Even if we assume that the head of the department from the Heritage of Ancestors and the most valuable specialist in the field of planning, economics and chemistry, all

did call for the Volkssturm, their disappearance in any case looks strange. Who knows, maybe they received new documents and turned out to be more successful than Dolezalek and Schneider, and therefore were not exposed. This version is supported by the sudden appearance of specialists in European integration in post-war Germany. Until recently, people who were nothing of themselves suddenly began to speak in a professional language and use formulations that were very reminiscent of the turns and vocabulary of Werner Deitz. One of these figures was Walter Hallstein, with whom Werner Deitz crossed paths during the years of the Nazi dictatorship at the Academy of German Law.

Walter Hallstein also had two biographies. Having become acquainted with one, I want to exclaim in a cinematic manner either "Good guy!", Or "Good German!". In the post-war period, Walter Hallstein contributed in every possible way to the return of Germany to the "bosom of the civilized world": professor at Georgetown University (USA), active member of UNESCO, founder of the European Coal and Steel Community, initiator of the Paris Conference, adviser to the Federal Chancellor of Germany, State Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs West Germany, chairman of the European Commission for the creation of a "common European market", head of the International European Movement, holder of the Bavarian Order of Merit, laureate of the Charlemagne International Prize. And everything would be fine if Walter Hallstein did not have a second biography.

Walter Hallstein was born on November 17, 1901 in Rostock, into a Lutheran family of a government official. In 1925 he defended a diploma in jurisprudence at the University of Berlin. Then he worked in the field of international law, since 1929 he was a Privatdozent at the same Berlin University. The official biographers of Hallstein, in fact, as European historians, either do not remember all subsequent events, or remember, but very reluctantly. The fact is that Walter Hallstein was a member of many Nazi organizations - later, at every opportunity, he stated that he had never supported the Hitler regime, but after the collapse of the Third Reich, almost all Germans in a row said this. Considering how many "anti-fascists" and "oppositionists" appeared in those days, one can only wonder: how did Hitler come to power in the first place? One could believe in the cowardly conformism of Hallstein, they say, he supported the criminal regime in the name of

self-preservation, but the documents say something completely different.

Immediately after Hitler came to power, Walter Hallstein quite successfully and painlessly passed the unification, that is, he was included in the profile of the National Socialist organizations. At first he became a member of the National Socialist Union of Lawyers. Then (after the transformation of the union) he became a member of the National Socialist Union of Human Rights Defenders. On September 30, 1935, confirming his loyalty to the Hitlerite government, he took the following oath: 1918] I was a member of the following organizations: As an Associate of Law, I was a member of the Association of Reich Trainees, and as a professor, I was a member of the Association of German Reich Universities. At the moment I am a member of the National Socialist Union of German Lawyers, the National Socialist Union of Teachers and Teachers.

Almost immediately after taking this peculiar oath, Walter Hallstein was appointed dean of the Faculty of Law and Economics at the University of Rostock. However, when, after the end of World War II, Hallstein had to fill out denazification questionnaires, he denied not only belonging to any political and National Socialist organizations, but also that he had ever made public speeches that contained elements of the National Socialist ideology. However, Hallstein has repeatedly spoken in public, which has been documented. For example, kept

theses of his speech in January 1939, when he gave a public lecture on "The Greater German Reich as a Legal Entity". An eyewitness account of this event in Nazi propaganda was published by the Nizhnegermanski Obozrevatel newspaper the following day, January 24, 1939. Let us cite this material: "Legal personality of the Great German Empire. Lecture evening of the University of Rostock - a speech by Professor Hallstein. Rostock, 24 January. A lecture took place in the beer house "Man and Olerich". evening.

Prof. Dr. Ruickholdt, Dean of the University, published an announcement about the upcoming event. In his opening speech, he welcomed Minister of State Dr. Scharf, representatives of the party and its organizations, representatives of the Wehrmacht, the Imperial Labor Service, the city of Rostock, as well as representatives of business and the student organization. Ruickholdt, on behalf of the university, expressed the hope that this

the evening can help build trust and understanding between the public and the university, because although it is an old institution, given its long history and tradition, it is not so alien to modernity. According to Ruickholdt, the Fuehrer's appreciation of the German universities as bearers of a valuable tradition can be seen in the fact that in 1938 the heads of the universities attended the NSDAP imperial congress held in Nuremberg in their historical attire. The host of the evening would be Dr. Hallstein, a professor of law who, thanks to his research in comparative law, has an impressive knowledge of European legal policy. He considered the issue of legal accession of the Eastern Mark and the Sudetenland. Prof. Dr. Hallstein's meaningful statements were met with thunderous applause. The meeting ended with an informal party. In addition to the Minister of State, among the guests of honor were: Major Folgman, garrison commander Colonel Lieb, Arbeitsführer Schroeder, etc.

This lecture evening was not just a university event, but a propaganda event, which was emphasized not only by its location (beer house) and the wearing of uniforms prescribed by a special circular, but also by the presence of officials, both on the side of the party and on the side of the state. Before the beginning of the evening, Hallstein submitted a special certificate to the rector of the University of Rostock, which stated: "Today there will be a report on the topic" Legal personality of the Greater German Reich Empire "me as a scientist whose scientific work, on the one hand, was focused on a comparative analysis of European legal systems.

On the other hand, actively participating in the activities of the Academy of German Law, I am extremely well acquainted with the legal and political goals of the Third Reich. Thus, I was invited to make a statement from the standpoint of legal science regarding the merger of the new German territories with the "old empire".

Since it is clear that by this time Hallstein was already engaged (at least in part) in the development of the "European project", some of the excerpts from his speech are of the highest interest. The human rights activist has three tasks: he must know the law, apply it and develop it further. The most important of these tasks is the third, because everything we do is governed by the law of development. We should pay attention not only to existing laws, but especially to the lawmaking of the future. The task of our

legal policy is not only to support the existing, but also to create a better order. I must explain why it is the human rights defender who is called upon to cope with this task. The leadership of the state has unconditional and final authority in making all decisions related to the creation of such a community.

Do the leadership of the state need lawyers to carry out this political task? An individual lawyer may want to consider this issue from a professional and psychological point of view, which is understandable. Lawyers are usually busy all their lives regulating and controlling the movement of society in a sphere strictly limited by thousands of paragraphs of laws, busy with daily chores like "patching fences" and "cleaning ditches." So

Thus lawyers will be strongly tempted to deviate from the emancipatory action of lawmaking, a challenge to the courage that characterizes every advance in unfamiliar territory. They will gladly welcome the opportunity to either be part of a grandiose grand planning - or they will simply cultivate their own modest (legal) garden, left to their care.

If one does not know that the author of these words will become the legal founder of the European Union in the future, then they might at first glance seem like a set of banal legal maxims. Hallstein further stated: "Nevertheless, the reason why a human rights defender is entrusted with such an "architectural" task arises from the "needs and needs" of the community. The creation of this new legal policy requires the support of lawyers who are at the head of the field of application of law, who know the law and the rules of lawmaking, since it is obvious that it is necessary to have an idea of "good" in order to be able to find what is "better". I am convinced, however, that this call for new legislation should be given a deeper justification. I believe that it should come from the very nature of the instructions given by the people to the human rights activist. By virtue of the law of nature inherent in the human rights profession, he must ultimately be the responsible architect of the law. The relationship between the human rights activist and the law today is different from the "legal positivism" of the late nineteenth century, which was the prevailing opinion until the beginning of the century. Creating a new law is the only task of legislators, and the role of the judge is limited to reconciling - subordinating - "life facts" with the facts defined by law. He tries to free the law from accidents and reveals a strengthening system of law that

ties legal consequences to a random event.

All branches of legal activity are part of the purification: the scientific theory of law, the conclusions of which are reduced to the proposal of solutions for application in practice, the daily work of front-line officers [!] of law, who become defenders of the offended sense of justice [!] and also the judge, who, by his decision, finally certifies the demands rights. All these elements transform the law into a pedantic continuous struggle, during which people must always remember the law. The true nature of the lawful constitution of human beings can only be understood by those observers who not only look at the laws, but also take into account the intense synergy of all these forces. This "widely practiced method" should be used when it becomes necessary to completely modernize the entire legal system, beyond the possibilities of current modifications. This is even more true when a complete overturn of the legal system on a revolutionary scale requires the use of all available forces.

And further: "Today we see that the entire community of human rights defenders — all members of the legal profession, if you like — are taking part in the colossal task of popular modernization of law. The truth is that no single law can contain all possible life and that any formalization of legal facts can only be an attempt to highlight typical bases for decision making. Thus, as has been known since ancient times, the logic of a lawyer must necessarily be similar. The most outstanding feature of today's legal state will forever remain a total legal policy. This means an unprecedented sweeping and deep reversal of the obsolete legal system in its most remote corners. The result of this renewal will characterize the cultural face of the new era. In the past, this process was an event within the ordinary borders and belonged to the internal affairs of small Germany. Epochal events, however, present this process in a completely new light. All internal problems, all internal tasks are overshadowed by the grandeur of annexation, they will be eliminated by the amazing impulses that legal policy will receive from the return home of Austria and the Sudetenland. The task is no longer simply to renovate a dilapidated old building, but to build a new building for an enlarged family of nations in an expanded territory of nations. The question will be: is it really necessary to build only one building?

If we correlate all these requirements with the project of creating

"European Union", then the picture is extremely depressing. Actually, both the planned in the Third Reich and the current European Union were based not on the will of the peoples, but on the dictates of abstract principles. Hallstein stated in 1939: "This brings us directly to the first problem of legal policy posed by the annexation of territories: why should one single legal system be the foundation of Germany? It's not just about material convenience. This Greater German Reich is increasingly becoming a single economic entity. Thus, for the Greater German Reich, a common legal system is not something that automatically appears when this (future) Reich is created, but is a task. An ingenuous observer of this situation might think that such a task would be a piece of cake. One may get the impression that only one prescription needs to be issued, namely, that all the laws of the "old empire" should immediately be put into effect in Austria and the Sudetenland. However, the task at hand is not so simple. It is impossible to introduce in such a territory all our laws fixed on paper at once. Such a strategy would be unsuccessful already because of the obvious limitations of the mental abilities of those people who would have to apply these laws. Such an attempt might also fail because of the complexity of the structure of the modern social order. You can't just change the legal system, like a dress that has already gone out of fashion, because any fundamental change also affects, so to speak, the individuality of people.

Now I turn to specific issues of clarifying laws. It is necessary to single out a number of norms, the introduction of which cannot be delayed; they represent a certain emergency program within the framework of the process of unification of law. The structure of government in Austria and the Sudetenland, which is currently in the formative phase, will serve as a model for the future system of government for the entire Reich. This was pointed out a few days ago by Reich Minister of the Interior Frick during a speech at the Academy of Administrative Administration in Hamburg.

At first glance, it may seem that there is no need to quote in such detail the report delivered in 1939. However, the paradox of the situation lies in the fact that Hallstein left the main postulates and main theses in his legal constructions unchanged even after the end of the war. In his book *The European Community*, which has been reprinted many times and is considered hardly

not the ABC of modern European integration, Hallstein, in the section devoted to changing "European law", resorted to all the same principles and the same formulations as in the late 30s. He only changed the ideological color of his phrases; This mimicry turned out to be quite enough for the average European reader not to be able to detect the catch. The "Other Germany" is nothing more than a trick - old wine poured into new wineskins, but nothing more.

Chapter 16

At the very beginning of 1943, as part of the Ancestors' Heritage Research Society, which at that time received the status of department "A" at the personal headquarters of the Reichsführer SS, a new department was created, which was supposed to deal with the problems of sociolinguistics. The structure located in Frankfurt an der Oder was also referred to in the documents as a "research center" or "educational and research institution for applied linguistic sociology." The activities of this department, unlike many structures of the Heritage of Ancestors, were top secret. Not only the "enemies of Germany", but also representatives of various national socialist organizations should not have known about the results of its activities, which primarily belonged to the department of Alfred Rosenberg. Questions seem quite logical: why did the SS show interest in the problems of sociolinguistics? What did the Ahnenerbe actually do in this department? Why was the activity of this structure so classified that the results of its work were supposed to be hidden even from the key figures of the National Socialist Party? At the moment, we have a sufficient number of documents and documentary evidence to restore in detail both the prehistory of the emergence of this mysterious department, and its activities, traces of which are lost at the very end of the war in the area located in Lower Saxony

town of Uelzen. Already after the end of the war, former consultants of this department of Ancestral Heritage, prominent German linguists, such as Leo Weisgerber, tried to say that the leadership of the "center of sociolinguistics" was close to the Resistance movement, but they preferred to ignore their opinion.

The history of the mysterious department of the Ahnenerbe, which dealt with the problems of sociolinguistics, was directly connected with the name of Georg Schmidt-Rohr. He was born on July 25, 1890 in Frankfurt an der Oder. His father was a teacher, Richard Schmidt, and his mother was the daughter of a local industrialist, Ruth Rohr. As a result, their son Georg chose to take a double surname and from the 30s he signed documents everywhere as Schmidt-Rohr. From his youth, George was very active. For example, he was an activist in the nationally oriented anti-urban movement Migratory Birds. After the end of the First World War in

relatively mature age, he became one of the founders and leaders of the Kronach Union of Old Migratory Birds, representing the interests of this movement both as part of the Imperial Committee of German Youth Unions and in the youth political council under the government of the Weimar Republic. However, political fame (albeit in narrow circles) came to Schmidt-Rohr earlier, during the years of the World War, when he, being the captain of the infantry regiment of Duke Friedrich Wilhelm of Brunswick, in 1917 began to develop a special linguistic program for the occupied (at that time) territories of the Russian Empire. He tried to implement this project together with the famous publicist and traveler Paul Rohrbach. In their co-authorship, the memorandum "What needs to be done to prevent the coming revolution?" Unfortunately, neither the text of this memorandum nor the text of the special project for the Russian Empire has been preserved. We know about them only from notes left by Schmidt-Rohr himself. However, in the archives it was possible to find a voluminous work "Our mother tongue as a weapon and tool of German thinking", dated approximately to the same time. This allows us to look at the principles that guided Schmidt-Rohr in the last years of the First World War.

In our case, it seems important not so much the very construction of scientific and political projects (later it was finalized several times), but the fact that its author from the very beginning planned not just practical, but political, I would even say geopolitical, use of the sociolinguistics he created. After the defeat of Germany in the First World War, Georg Schmidt-Rohr did not abandon his projects and continued to develop sociolinguistics. In the early 1920s, he enjoyed the support of the Prussian Minister for Education and Religion, Karl-Heinrich Becker. It was under his patronage that Schmidt-Rohr was enrolled in the newly created "Pedagogical Academy" in 1926. In 1932, with the support of the "German Academy", headed by the founder of geopolitics, Professor Karl Haushofer, Schmidt-Rohr's work "Language as the Representation of the People" was published. After the Nazis came to power, this book was heavily revised and published in 1933 under the title "Native Language. On the management of the language up to the formation of the people. As part of this work, Schmidt-Rohr tried to form the principles of linguofascism, which, in the light of Hitler's rise to power, seemed to him an eminently successful undertaking. However, Schmidt-Rohr was wrong. Proposed

to them, linguofascism did not take into account the racial ideas on which the national socialist ideology rested. Schmidt-Rohr immediately came under fire from party dogmatists. Things got to the point that they intended to expel him from the National Socialist Party, which could have very unpleasant consequences for the researcher. However, Professor Karl Haushofer and publisher Hugo Bruckmann decided to stand up for Schmidt-Rohr - the first was friendly with Rudolf Hess, the deputy Führer for the party, the second was well acquainted with Hitler in Munich when he was just starting his political career. As a result, the persecution of Schmidt-Rohr was stopped - it was decided to leave the researcher alone.

Political background aside, it is impossible not to note that the work of Schmidt-Rohr, which caused discontent among the Nazis, was not just an interesting incident in the history of science, but a truly innovative breakthrough in the general history of linguistics. Schmidt-Rohr's book was in its own way

anticipated by Leo Weisgerber's doctoral thesis "Native Language and Intellectual Development", which was defended in 1929. Developing the proposed theories, Schmidt-Rohr proposed a number of provisions that are currently public property in the field of linguistics. But with all this, we must not forget that Schmidt-Rohr in his constructions proceeded from extreme nationalist convictions, and the fact that he did not take into account the racist postulates of National Socialism does not at all make him a participant in anti-fascist resistance. This is confirmed by the fact that Schmidt-Rohr found a patron in the person of the Reichsführer SS, who allowed the linguist to create a secret department as part of the "Heritage of the Ancestors".

Most likely, the activities of Schmidt-Rohr came to the attention of the SS chief, Heinrich Himmler, in 1940, when the researcher prepared a memorandum on the need to create a special secret linguistic department. This document seems to us to be extremely important, and therefore we will present the main provisions set forth in the aforementioned memorandum. In the preamble, Schmidt-Rohr reported: "There are a significant number of tasks that are brought to life by the essence of language as a political entity. However, they still have not found their implementation in a unified and qualified form. What tasks did Schmidt-Rohr see. There were three of them:

- the preservation and strengthening of the German nationality in areas of contact with other peoples;
- the political transformation of Europe, focused on the elimination of linguistic contradictions, which in turn should have

determined by German interests;

- after the alleged victory over England, it was planned to influence 200 million people who were native speakers of the English language, which even in "peaceful conditions" would continue to be an important political factor.

The "secret linguistic department" invented by Schmidt-Rohr was supposed to combine several functions at once. It was supposed to be both a research structure dealing with the study of the struggle of cultures, and an information center in which information coming from different parts of Europe was to be summarized, and an agency advising the political leadership of the Reich, and a department preparing practical recommendations for the implementation of propaganda and the formation of mass consciousness .

Desiring to be involved in the sphere of real politics at all costs, Schmidt-Rohr wrote in his memorandum: "The need for research work cannot be underestimated. There is no such number of misconceptions in any field of knowledge as in linguistics. The fighters for the interests of the people themselves are often politically short-sighted. Only verified scientific justification can give an understanding of what really benefits and what should be used when building tactics and action strategies. Obviously, in the struggle for nationality, certain measures may be useful in one area, but harmful in another. It is for this reason that it is necessary to create a central linguistic and political institution that would issue the correct combat passwords for each of the areas of activity. Apparently, Schmidt-Rohr was aware of some of the details of the "competence struggle", that is, the internal contradictions that existed between individual functionaries of the Third Reich. This can explain the following phrase from the memorandum: "Also, the authorities must secure this institution, since it is inevitable that it will issue orders and appeals that some people will consider wrong, which will seem uncomfortable

and inappropriate."

If Schmidt-Rohr considered the creation of a secret linguistic department as one big project, then initially he saw the work of this structure in several directions, that is, it was supposed to implement seven subprojects. First, Schmidt-Rohr planned to make German the language of international communication. Of particular concern to the German linguist was the position of the English language,

which, in his opinion, without much political effort has become a powerful tool of international influence. Schmidt-Rohr was well aware that even if London was turned into a heap of ruin and Britain was occupied, there would still be about 200 million English-speaking people in the world. Purely directive bans could hardly produce the desired result. For this reason, Schmidt-Rohr suggested that the gradual displacement of the English language begin with the formation of cultural structures that could replace in the mass consciousness such "myths" as the "American dream", "the English way of life", etc. After the alleged victory over Great Britain Ireland was supposed to be an experimental platform for testing these cultural manipulations, and then spread the accumulated experience to all territories controlled by the Third Reich. The note read: "Even today, basic English is a political reality. After the military defeat of Great Britain, with a certain degree of probability, an Anglo-Saxon cultural renaissance can be expected. That is why we must prepare today to oppose these processes. Naturally, these things should be done by highly qualified specialists with a natural instinct and a good understanding of the Anglo-Saxon lifestyle. The second subproject was to be work with mixed ethnic groups. This primarily applied to the border areas. In the spring of 1940, Schmidt-Rohr was already offering his views to the SD in a memorandum called "Resettlement and de-ethnization." Further, spelling issues followed as a separate subproject. In this case, it was not about the German language, but the rules of the Slavic languages, which were supposed to change, resembling the forms of the German language. The next three sub-projects related to three European territories: Holland, Alsace and Switzerland. With regard to Holland, the authorities of the Third Reich had to pursue a special policy. On the one hand, in every possible way to emphasize the ancient relationship of the Germans and the Dutch, on the other hand, to deny independence to the Dutch language, equating it to one of the German dialects. In Alsace, it was supposed to carry out a conscious opposition between German-speaking and French-speaking inhabitants, which was supposed to lead to a reduction in the latter. In Switzerland, it was planned to enlist the support of the Germans living there, so that they would in every possible way prevent the formation of the Swiss dialect. The last subproject was to be the reform of the spelling of the German language.

The new rules of the German language were supposed to contribute to its spread in the world. It should be noted that the reform of the German language was already launched in the modern European Union in 1996. Schmidt-Rohr ended his memorandum with a pathetic appeal: "Only victory in the struggle for nationality, only victory in the economic battle, only victory in the cultural and political confrontation at the level of language will make the victory of our weapons the greatest triumph in world history."

We know from history how easy it was to captivate Heinrich Himmler with some unusual idea. Schmidt-Rohr was no exception in this respect. By the time the Reichsführer SS drew attention to him, the linguist already had more than a hundred scientific and pseudo-scientific publications (most of them, as well as the archives of the sociolinguistics department, are considered lost).

If you look at the chronology of the activity of the department of sociolinguistics that existed for a relatively short time, as well as at the biography of its leader, it might seem that Schmidt-Rohr was a kind of "shooter who managed to do everything." But such an impression is very erroneous. Even if you study the first work that Schmidt-Rohr wrote in 1917, you can see the fundamental ideas that Weisgerber would take up only twelve years later. The works devoted to the "native speech" are not just qualified, but contain many innovative approaches and a critical assessment is possible only from a political, but not as a non-scientific point of view. According to the surviving testimonies of Wolfram Sievers, the organizational head of Heritage of Ancestors, the name "Department of Sociolinguistics" was largely conditional and even disguised, in fact, as it should be, the name of structures whose activities were classified. Georg Schmidt-Rohr did not at all invent this term himself, since in the Indo-German Yearbook of those years there already existed a permanent heading "Linguistic Sociology". Schmidt-Rohr and the SS researchers from the Ahnenerbe were by no means engaged in the study of speech diversity, as they did

the then linguists Hans Naumann or Eugen Lerch. The department was engaged in the development of mainly linguo-political events focused on the notorious "transformation" of Europe. In fact, it was about strengthening German hegemony on the continent, which was to be ensured at the grassroots, speech level. However, such political attitudes did not exclude the fact that, to some extent, the Schmidt-Rohr department was still engaged in the scientific development of linguistics, but this was more

degree of side effect.

The tasks that were assigned to the secret department of sociolinguistics were not clearly spelled out in the charter of the "Heritage of the Ancestors" or any other official documents. Schmidt-Rohr himself on this occasion noted more than once that he was almost the favorite researcher of the Reichsfuehrer SS, who, in his characteristic manner, could come up with assignments literally on the go. If we summarize everything that Schmidt-Rohr did as part of the Ahnenerbe, then three large blocks of problems emerge. First, Schmidt-Rohr had to defend his doctoral dissertation by all means, which was required to be done by all the researchers of the Heritage of Ancestors, at least the full-time heads of departments. Secondly, he was engaged in a theoretical study of the functional foundations of the interaction between speech and people (language and ethnic group). Thirdly, he prepared practical recommendations for the implementation of the "people's policy" in the territory of occupied Europe.

Strange as it may seem, Schmidt-Rohr had the most problems with the defense of his doctoral dissertation. During his many trips around Germany, he tried in vain to find a professor who would agree, at least formally, to become his supervisor. For doctoral studies, he first turned to Weisgerber and Mitsk. However, Weisgerber, who taught at the University of Bonn, headed the department of Celtology, and Schmidt-Rohr had nothing to do with the Celtic languages, for this reason he was not admitted to the department even as a co-referent. Failure awaited Schmidt-Rohr in Marburg, where Micka worked. This linguist was an employee of the office of Alfred Rosenberg, whom Heinrich Himmler regarded as the main competitor in the field of the humanities.

Immediately after this, Schmidt-Rohr turned to the Berlin scholar Pfeffer, who specialized in the study of foreign languages, and the Munich ethnographer Rumpf. Pfeffer, in an oral conversation that took place during a joint train ride, refused. Obtaining a doctorate at the University of Munich was no less problematic. By coincidence, other employees of the Heritage of Ancestors, namely Bruno Schweitzer and Otto Plassman, have already received "shelter" in this higher educational institution. The appearance of another "blatnik" from the Ahnenerbe could appeal to frank dissatisfaction in the academic community. To solve the problem, it was decided to involve the scientific curator of the "Heritage of the Ancestors" Professor Walter Wüst, who, among other things, in those years held the post

Rector of the University of Munich On October 23, 1943, an extended meeting took place, in which Walter Wüst, Georg Schmidt-Rohr, the Indo-Germanist Sommer, the specialist in Romance languages Vossler and the ethnographer Rumpf took part. As a result, it was Rumpf who was instructed "as soon as possible" to bring the text of Schmidt-Rohr's dissertation to defense. But here the innovator linguist from Heritage of Ancestors failed. Sommer interfered in every possible way with the execution of this order, and therefore Schmidt-Rohr was forced to refuse to cooperate with his faculty. The reason for this "sabotage" most likely lay in purely personal moments - even while studying at the University of Jena, Sommer and Schmidt-Rohr had a conflict. In one of the letters, Schmidt-Rohr informed the organizational head of the Ahnenerbe, Wolfram Sievers, that "Professor Sommer qualified my correct ways of solving the [designated scientific] problem as erroneous."

Schmidt-Rohr managed to defend his dissertation only on the third attempt. This time, the head of the secret department of the Heritage of Ancestors decided to try his luck in Vienna, with a specialist in speech psychology, Friedrich Krantz. It cannot be said that this professor was enthusiastic about the proposal, but just in case he decided not to tempt fate. In a number of reviews

Krantz openly pointed out that the dissertation research test prepared by Schmidt-Rohr was incomplete, it clearly lacked several chapters, in addition, the work at many points was openly political and even propagandistic in nature. But since in 1943 there were no clear criteria that could be applied in evaluating works in sociolinguistics, Friedrich Krantz signed a petition for the granting of doctoral studies to Georg Schmidt-Rohr. He did not become a professor only because he went missing at the end of the war.

In the period from 1943 to 1945, Georg Schmidt-Rohr "produced" an unusually large number of documents that had almost a programmatic character. In order to understand what tasks were faced by the Ancestral Heritage Department, whose work was classified, here is a short list of the documents mentioned above:

Memorandums and memos on topical linguistic and political issues:

— "Using the Labor of Alien Workers" (March 1943)

- "Tasks of the Department of Sociolinguistics" (for SS employees of the Imperial Ministry of Science, June 1943)

- "The tasks of the people's leadership in relation to the people's speech" (June 1, 1943)

- "The affirmation of German folk life through spirit, soul and customs" (September 1943)

— "Letter on the German Language" (June 27, 1944)

- "Letter on the events of July 20, 1944"

- "German life through the German language" (July 1944)

- "Comparison of the problem of desertion in 1919 and 1944" (October 1944)

- new memorandum on the department of sociolinguistics (December 1944)

Popular science works:

- "Book for a soldier's backpack" (November 1943)

- "Complex primer" (August 1944),

— Brochures and materials for the "SS Guidebooks"

- "The Formation of Man and Speech"

- "On the border between man and animal - people and speech"

— "Invisible language struggle in people's life"

- "Planned linguistic confrontation."

— "Spiritual mobilization for the struggle for the preservation of the German language"

— "Literary language and dialects"

Scientific works (until the end of the war, Schmidt-Rohr worked on a four-volume book, which bore the code name "What does language mean for the people"). Volume one: "Language as a political factor of force in the struggle for the existence of the people." Volume two: "Achievements and honor of the German language. Tasks for their more effective design in the life of the people. Volume three: notes to the first two volumes. Volume Four: "The essence of grammatical forms and their significance for human

thinking and human life-affirmation. The first two volumes were to be presented in a popular form accessible to the average reader. And the third and fourth volumes were reassigned purely for specialists, scientists and researchers. By the end of 1944, Schmidt-Rohr had prepared the text of the first and third volumes, which amounted to approximately 600 pages of text. It is possible that the four-volume edition in question was supposed to duplicate the text of the dissertation that Schmidt-Rohr was working on in its main points. In addition, in 1945, he informed Walter Wüst as the scientific curator of the Heritage of Ancestors about the work on the manuscript "general linguistics

and a new construction of grammar.

Among the documents discovered by Professor Gerd Simon, which came from the pen of Schmidt-Rohr, the most indicative is the above-mentioned memorandum "The affirmation of German folk life through spirit, soul and customs." It was written in September 1943 and already in the first days of October was on the table of the organizational head of the Ancestral Heritage, SS Standartenführer Wolfram Sievers. The document is interesting at least from the point of view that it characterizes various departments and ministries of the Third Reich. However, open criticism was only addressed to the Imperial Ministry of Propaganda and Public Education, which was headed by Joseph Goebbels. It was assumed that Heinrich Himmler could correct the general direction of the policy pursued in the territory of occupied Europe. As if hedging himself in advance against the unforeseen consequences that the appearance of this document could cause, Georg Schmidt Rohr stated that he wrote the memorandum with a "feeling of depression and great inner embarrassment." The note was not without some ingratiating passages. In particular, Schmidt-Rohr wrote: "I was informed that the Reichsführer SS, with the most generous tolerance, which is rare for a person of such rank, is ready to listen to the most uncomfortable opinions and unpleasant truths, even if he himself does not share such a point of view. Often he shows gratitude to the people who mustered up the courage to tell him this eye-pricking truth. And if I am not mistaken in these important premises, then it makes sense to move my memorandum and present it to the Reichsführer SS. In it, I do not so much tell an inconvenient truth as I give a brief overview of the most unsatisfactory state of affairs. All my thoughts and aspirations are aimed at strengthening the might of the National Socialist state, improving its internal, moral and spiritual forces. I would not like to put myself in danger if my noblest intentions are misunderstood. However, if necessary, I am ready to take responsibility for what is stated [in the memorandum]. It would be unforgivable if, in my current position, I did not try to put into practice the knowledge and skills that I possess.

If the text of the memorandum is studied without the accompanying cover letter, an excerpt from which we have cited above, then it could be interpreted as a kind of protest act. Like, the key figures of the Third Reich should themselves set an example in order to lead the people.

However, if we consider the problem as a whole, we can see that it was an attempt to create "another Germany", that is, the intention to carry out socio-political mimicry so that Germany could continue to dominate the continent, "transforming" Europe and building its own European Union. Schmidt-Rohr outlined his program of action in thirteen points of criticism of the current situation:

1. "The most unceremonious corruption has become widespread, which sooner or later should give rise to a youth protest movement."
2. Lack of nobility and breadth of nature. "Everywhere pettiness is manifested, which is taken out on women and children - this is unacceptable, even when it comes to representatives of lower races."
3. A clear lack of obedience. "Instead of cold-blooded courage, we can observe inappropriate youthfulness and disoriented heroism, which often results in

disobedience of orders."

4. Thriving sexual debauchery. "Sexual abstinence is prescribed only for ordinary people."

5. The youth in the National Socialist Ordersburgs are brought up in the wrong way. Schmidt-Rohr proposed to introduce the "Spartan system". In particular, he criticized propaganda films as causing a backlash in ordinary people.

6. The program of rationalization in agriculture of the Third Reich. He considered the problem excluded from a military point of view, more precisely, from the point of view of the economy of the war period: "The utmost rationalization of human labor is necessary so that in case of war men can be drafted into the army. The work of several small mills can be compensated by the work of one large one, and the freed millers can be put under arms.

7. A clear lack of forms and phenomena that would cause admiration abroad. "The stubborn repetition: "great adversary - a lot of respect" - in practice turns out to be the password of political helplessness, which leads to the undermining of German strength."

8. Rejection of the German spelling and the Gothic font. Schmidt-Rohr considered this a cardinal mistake. He equated this step with "a renunciation of our cultural heritage and a refusal to defend the German nation for its own rights."

9. "The greatest threat to really fruitful and useful thinking in life is doctrinairism,

manifested, for example, in the imposition of ready-made worldview formulas. In this part, Schmidt-Rohr even ventured to praise the Stalin-Ribbentrop pact: "We must go with the devil, even against the devil, if it is in the interests of Germany."

10. Schmidt-Rohr warned of the impossibility of strengthening German hegemony in Europe only by force. "You can't take over a diverse world with only a squadron of bombers and concentration camps."

11. "Clumsy work" of the Ministry of Propaganda. "They don't even always bother to hide the strings with which they control their puppets."

12. A party with "bureaucracy" has become "the epitome of injustice."

13. The leadership of the party and the state has deprived science of the freedom of choice. Schmidt-Rohr's proposal on this subject was as follows: "Science - true freedom: the people - a convincing and serene illusion of freedom."

The creation of a "convincing illusion" was planned by Schmidt-Rohr as early as 1933. Immediately after Hitler came to power, he wrote: "A man of the people should not in any way determine the political measures carried out by the leadership, he is not even the subject of politics in the full sense of the word. But this person from the people should feel himself not only an object, but also a subject of politics." These principles were put into practice not in the Third Reich, but decades later. It can be unequivocally stated that in the modern European Union the political hypocrisy reserved by Schmidt-Rohr has reached its apogee.

Wolfram Sievers handed over the memorandum to the personal assistant of the Reichsführer SS Rudolf Brandt, who, among other things, was also Heinrich Himmler's deputy as President of the Ancestral Heritage. A draft of the answer, which was prepared by Brandt, has been preserved. In it, he asked Schmidt-Rohr to soften his wording. However, it is not known whether Himmler and Schmidt-Rohr talked about this. It is also unknown whether Himmler saw the said memorandum. In any case, Schmidt-Rohr wrote in one of his letters to Brandt: "I am not a charlatan and cannot promise that I can change the fate of the country. I only commit to everything

zeal to help her cope with her fate, if at all in human power to somehow influence these fatal processes.

Before completing the story about Schmitt-Rohr, it should be noted that many of his ideas were implemented in modern Europe: the German language was reformed, Germany changed its appearance, but still strives for dominance on the continent. The recommendations regarding Russia also turned out to be heard. At the very beginning of World War II, Schmidt-Rohr proposed a "linguo-political fragmentation of the Russian empire" (apparently, he could not abandon the terminology that he used back in 1917). Schmidt-Rohr admitted that a purely forceful influence could hardly break the Russian people, and therefore proposed to undermine their unity from within. It was proposed to use the territory of Ukraine as a platform for the implementation of the pilot program. In this case, Schmidt-Rohr insisted on the implementation of the following measures: 1) the creation of a literary Ukrainian language; 2) the creation of Ukrainian writing; 3) creation of a special Ukrainian alphabet; 4) development of a special Ukrainian spelling; 5) formation of artificial Ukrainian vocabulary. In all these points, it was important that all of them, starting from the vocabulary, ending with the alphabet, had to be as different as possible from Russian. If we resort to scientific terms, then Schmidt-Rohr was one of the initiators of the program of systematic linguocide of the Russian language on the territory of Ukraine. During the Second World War, Schmidt-Rohr's plans failed to come true, but they were fully implemented by the current leadership of the European Union, which in every possible way contributed to the outbreak of the civil war in Ukraine.

Applications

Document 1. From the directive of Joseph Goebbels dated February 15, 1943 to the Reichsleiters, Gauleiters and heads of regional propaganda departments

In his address on January 30, 1943, the Führer directly pointed out the significance of the National Socialist struggle in the past, present and future, not only for Germany, but for the whole of Europe:

"Only today ... we are fully aware of what would have become of Germany and all of Europe if, on January 30, 1933, Providence, through the hands of the Reich President and Field Marshal von Hindenburg, had not transferred power to National Socialism. (...)

What would have happened to the German people and to Europe if on June 22, 1941, at the last minute, the new German Wehrmacht had not screened the continent with its shield? Who would believe that ridiculous guarantees and the same useless paper statements of Anglo-Saxon statesmen would have saved the world from the attack of a power that, as American correspondents now calmly write, had for twenty years one and only goal ... to attack Europe and destroy it culture. (...)

... So even now there are only two alternatives: either Germany, the German Wehrmacht, the countries allied with us and, consequently, Europe, will win, or the Central Asian-Bolshevik wave will pour from the East to the oldest cultural continent, destroying and destroying everything in its path, in the same way as it was already in Russia itself.

From this follow the following clear requirements, which must be taken into account in speeches, articles and other publications regarding the treatment of European peoples living outside Germany, including the peoples of the East, as well as the plans of the Reich in the East:

1. Not only all the available and at our disposal forces of the German people must be mobilized for victory, but also the forces of those peoples who inhabit the countries occupied or conquered by us in the course of the war. All the forces of the European continent, and therefore, first of all, of the peoples of the East, must be thrown into the struggle against Jewish Bolshevism.

2. Therefore, all the propaganda work of the NSDAP and national

of a socialist state should be aimed at explaining not only to the German people, but also to the rest of the European peoples, including the peoples of the occupied eastern regions and countries still under Bolshevik domination, that the victory of Adolf Hitler and German arms is in their fundamental interests.

3. The task set does not allow these peoples, especially the population of the East, to be directly or indirectly subjected to humiliation and insult to their inner dignity, especially in public speeches or in the press.

You cannot call these people, representing the peoples of the East, who hope that we will bring them liberation, beasts and barbarians, and expect that they will be interested in the victory of Germany ...

4. Similarly, it is inappropriate to present the future New Order in Europe in such a way that other peoples might get the impression that the German leadership intends to keep them in constant submission.

Sayings that Germany will create colonies in the East and will pursue a colonial policy, that she regards the country and its population as an object of exploitation, are completely out of place. They would only give Soviet propaganda the welcome opportunity to assert that Germany puts the peoples of the East on the same level as the Negroes. This would only have the effect of strengthening the will of the people and the Soviet troops to resist the German Wehrmacht and the German Reich.

5. It is also inappropriate to talk about new German settlements, especially large ones, as well as about the alienation of lands or write theoretical articles on the topic of whether peoples or lands should be Germanized. It is the National Socialist principle that only the land can be Germanized that has already begun to be used by the enemy side as proof that the gigantic expulsion of peoples has been proclaimed as the plan of the Reich. It is impossible to give enemy, especially Soviet, propaganda a pretext for such an interpretation, since here, too, the result would be a strengthening of the will of the peoples of the East to resist.

Moreover, it is impossible to discuss the question of the expulsion of the indigenous population.

6. In contrast, at every opportunity that presents itself, the desire for freedom, the will to fight against the Bolshevik terrorist regime, which inspires the peoples oppressed by the Soviets, their soldierly prowess, as well as their hard work, should be emphasized. Examples include the participation of Eastern

peoples in national military units, as already highlighted in the report of the Wehrmacht High Command, reports of the labor of Eastern workers in the territory of the Reich, as well as the work of Eastern peoples in the industrial or agricultural enterprises of their homeland under German leadership, which contribute to the victory, in the armament of Germany and in ensuring the harvest.

7. The occupied eastern regions, after their systematic destruction by Bolshevism (in accordance with Stalin's scorched earth order), are being restored under German leadership. With the wealth of the land there, this ensures Germany, all of Europe, and thereby the peoples living in the East, an abundance of food and raw materials and a social upsurge for all future times.

Thus, everything must be avoided that could jeopardize the cooperation of all European peoples, and especially the peoples of the East, necessary for victory. Each slip would only give Soviet propaganda a reason to constantly refer to the testimony of the leading figures of the Reich, who allegedly set themselves the goal of enslaving the peoples of the East. Therefore, caution in statements will help to preserve German blood and win victory.

In full agreement with the head of the Party Chancellery [Martin Bormann], I ask that all these conclusions from the Führer's directives be taken into account most strictly in all Party work, especially in propaganda.

All comments concerning the peoples of the East are in accordance with the directives of the Reich Minister for the Occupied Eastern Territories [Alfred Rosenberg] transmitted to the highest imperial authorities on the position of all responsible authorities on the issue of politics in the East, in particular on the treatment of the peoples of the East.

Document 2. Directives by Joachim von Ribbentrop of April 5, 1943 on the work of the Committee for European Affairs.

1. The main task of the Committee at the present stage of the war is to collect materials and prepare documents that will be needed to resolve the issues of the New Order in Europe at the time of the end of the war. Therefore, the development of definite plans for the general arrangement of the future Europe must be postponed for the time being. It is necessary to proceed from the fact that in the future ties will be established between the Greater German Reich and individual European countries - partly quite close, partly looser, which do not fit into a single schematic diagram.

formula. For each individual country and for each people, a special decision will have to be made at the appropriate time. However, it is already quite clear that the future Europe can only exist if the dominant position of the Greater German Reich is fully established. Therefore, securing this dominant position must be seen as the foundation of the future New Order. Further, consideration of those sets of issues that can be resolved within the framework of a pan-European settlement acquires particular importance.

2. Propaganda coverage of the European question must first of all go in the direction that, in appropriate cases, we formulate our goal in general terms as follows: it is to create a just New Order that will give the European peoples a secure existence within a close economic and cultural community and without outside supervision. A detailed discussion of the political structure of the future Europe is out of the question for the time being. If someone wants to announce the principles of building this structure, then for propaganda purposes they should meet the desire of the peoples for the most independent and independent statehood and contain promises in this spirit, while it is already now completely clear that just the opposite is true: the security of the future Europe in the face of a threat from outside will make limitations on independence inevitable and require sacrifices from each individual country. In addition, the complex state and national structure of Europe does not allow us to be guided here by principles that are the same for all countries.

Therefore, we must first confine ourselves to promising the different peoples to give each of them a proper place in the future Europe. However, any more in-depth discussion of this issue should generally be refrained from.

3. A very effective means for preparing the European peoples to understand the need for a future New Order is already now the appropriate use of the concern that the idea of the penetration of Bolshevism into Europe gives rise in all countries. The clearer becomes the intention of Soviet Russia in the event of an Allied victory in Europe to allow the existence of only those governments that will be acceptable to Moscow, that is, the Bolsheviks, and the clearer the understanding of the fact that only the German Wehrmacht can ward off this threat, the faster in all countries the understanding of measures related to the establishment of the European New Order will be strengthened,

which is designed primarily to prevent the occurrence of such a dangerous situation also in the future. In the same way, the need to isolate the Western powers in the interests of ensuring peace in Europe, that is, England and America from Europe, and to suppress

the future of their intervention. Therefore, the clarification of the military objectives of our enemies, and above all Moscow, is the best propaganda we can use at the present time in order to increase the understanding of the measures necessary for the future New Order in Europe; Europe must be organized in such a way that such a dangerous situation cannot be repeated. Therefore, there is no need to emphasize for propaganda purposes the conclusions that can be drawn from the current crisis situation when it comes to the future organization of Europe. The more you can get public opinion in individual countries to draw these conclusions for yourself, the better.

Document 3. Proposals by Hans Frowijn, June 7, 1943

The main ideas of the plan for the new Europe.

The closer the military situation approaches its resolution, the closer is the time when it is necessary to concretize the tasks and begin the implementation of our plan for establishing a New Order in Europe. In terms of propaganda, our opponents with their plans for the post-war period are at a disadvantage, because they have nothing new to offer the world, and also because their divisions, despite all attempts to cover them up, are becoming more and more obvious. The use of the propaganda benefits arising from this for us would have

important military value.

The plan must be realistic. The propaganda element, depending on the form of application, may be present only in the presentation of the main ideas of this plan taken seriously. The plan itself must be such that it will withstand any sober scrutiny by responsible governments.

In order to be convincing and attractive, the plan must take into account the aspirations of peoples for peace, a fair resolution of national problems, and economic and social well-being.

The main ideas of the plan are outlined below - schematically, without propagandistic and political arguments, in the shortest form. A more detailed development of ideas would require more accurate

consideration of individual issues with the participation of experts on various problems.

1. Basic principles.

The plan for a New Order in Europe must be built on a historical foundation, but taking into account the new ideas of National Socialism.

A solid historical foundation for today's Europe lies in a common old culture and in the coexistence determined by fate itself in a tight space of independent multilingual peoples who have a clear national identity that needs to organize, defend themselves, and, if necessary, defend themselves from the pressure of the interventionist and expansionist forces of two alien continents.

The ideas of National Socialism that should be used in establishing the New Order in Europe are the principle of leadership in the sense of relations of mutual loyalty (as opposed to the old notions of hegemony and imperialism), the principle of achievement (in the sense of the historical merits of the peoples and their achievements in the current war), the principle of organic order as opposed to the anarchic state of the formal equality of all states, and, finally, the principle of nationality, which is of decisive importance in questions of national groups and in the Jewish problem.

P. The political and military structure of Europe.

(a) The political and military structure of Europe is considered as a whole. Both are obviously closely related. A healthy and viable backbone of Europe must be created before the foundations of its life can take on real forms. This is possible only through individual, organic ordering of relations between individual peoples and states.

Stanovoy Ridge forms the Steel Pact between Germany and Italy and the Tripartite Pact. These foundations are further developed through a well-balanced military-political inclusion of other European countries and are turning into a completely pacified European community - for collective building inside and for a solidary rebuff to dangers threatening from outside - and, moreover, on a voluntary basis.

(6) From the geopolitical factors of Europe follows - without prejudice to the tasks to be solved jointly - the need

regional memberships. The strongest of them is the Great German Reich with the German and "sub-German" peoples (Eastern and South-Eastern) gravitating towards it. The organization of this force field, which is primarily tasked with ensuring the security of Europe from its immediate eastern neighbors, as well as the defense of the whole of Northern Europe, must take into account the diversity of actual relations in this area. Various forms of adherence to the Greater German Reich (in which Italy should also participate) are located between two poles: from inclusion in the Reich with the refusal of international legal capacity in foreign affairs (such as the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia) to elastic ties in the form of military-political treaties with maintaining their own diplomatic missions, etc. The main elements of which - depending on the situation in each individual case - agreements on > military-political issues may consist are: the unity of the basic principles of foreign policy, mutual information and consultations on political issues, military assistance in case of military conflicts with non-European states (possibly with periodic meetings of general staffs) and, if necessary for this purpose, the creation of joint pan-European military installations, such as strongholds and fortifications.

In addition to the region of the Greater German Reich, there is a region of the Mediterranean. Italy occupies a leading position here, therefore she must take care of the political and military organization of this area with the participation of Germany. Here an important role is played by the connection of Africa to Europe as its natural and necessary complement, especially since Italy has territorial rights and claims there on a large scale (empire).

The third region is the Atlantic. Here there may be a settlement through individual treaties between the Axis powers and the Atlantic countries of Europe. At the same time, for the Iberian Peninsula, not only the role of guardian at the gates from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean will be important, but, above all, the transition to Africa and the resolution of colonial problems there. France's functions in the Euro-African zone will be determined mainly by the conclusion of peace with the Axis powers and the territorial decisions connected with it. What role England will play in the Atlantic region and in Africa cannot be determined at present. It depends on whether after the war there will be a new England ready to join the New European Order, abandoning its old claims to

dominance in Europe and from their usual methods of securing it.

By concluding special treaties the question of the political and military structure of Africa as a joint possession of the European peoples will be settled. In doing so, first of all, the territorial relations of the colonial regions of Africa must be restructured or consolidated if they are retained in their former form, as well as the basic problems concerning the natives must be settled.

Further, the problems of the Middle East with Turkey as its link with Europe and the guardian of the Straits, as well as Egypt, which provide

communication with Africa and performing the tasks of the guardian of the Suez Canal. The political structure of the Middle East should be handed over to the countries there as independent nation-states, which themselves should determine the form of their unification. Europe should see to it in solidarity that no powers alien to this region interfere in the affairs of the Middle East, and that its political and economic interests (oil) are protected.

III. Relations between Europe and other continents.

(a) An important principle of the plan for Europe should be the requirement that Europe and any of its constituent states not interfere in the affairs of foreign continents and not seek to acquire political or military advantages there. On the other hand, any intervention, as well as the acquisition by other continents of any political or military advantages in Europe and Africa, must be excluded. Any such intervention and any such attack must be countered by the solidarity of the whole of Europe.

(6) Along with the principle of non-intervention, European countries must observe the principle of most favored nation towards each other in the face of non-European states; this principle will be applied mainly in the economic field. For the rest, relations between Europe, including its possession - Africa, with other continents will be regulated in accordance with the usual rules adopted in the field of interstate relations, on the basis of the principle that Europe wishes to live with them in peace and friendship and develop commercial relations. and cultural exchange, mutually beneficial for all involved.

(c) Since at the time of the end of the war there will still be territorial possessions of the European powers on other continents,

care for them should be regarded as the special affairs of these powers themselves; other European powers do not take it upon themselves to protect them. Conflicts arising from the existence of such possessions can interest Europe as a whole only in cases where they threaten to develop into an attack by non-European powers on European and African regions.

GU. Ensuring peace within Europe.

(a) The preservation of peace within Europe will be ensured by the conclusion of a European Peace Pact, which will fix not only the usual rules of procedure for the peaceful settlement of disputes, but also some practical principles. These include:

1. Independence and freedom of all European countries, voluntarily rallied into a closer community.
2. The right of each individual country to build its own national life at its own discretion, but taking into account obligations towards the European community.
3. Freedom in the development of relations between European countries in so far as the framework of European solidarity and European obligations is respected.
4. Freedom to develop relations with non-European countries - to the extent that they are compatible with European solidarity and European obligations.
5. Non-intervention of European countries in the affairs of non-European states and, accordingly, the prevention of any interference of non-European powers in European affairs.
6. All disputes between European countries are settled amicably. Any question that threatens to interfere with good neighborliness can be resolved peacefully.
7. If a threat to good neighborliness is created as a result of the fact that the boundaries of the settlement of individual peoples do not coincide with state boundaries, such a coincidence should, if possible, be achieved through a peaceful agreement or through resettlement. In case this is not possible,

the original existence of national groups living together with another nationality on the same state territory is ensured by the actions of the state authorities, if necessary - in a contractual manner.

8. Responsibility of each country to ensure that no action incompatible with European solidarity and

European obligations.

(6) In drawing up the procedural prescriptions of the Peace Pact, examples and experience from the pre-war years may be used. In the event of legal disputes, along with simple mediation, it would be necessary to provide for the involvement of the European Court, and to resolve conflicts arising from conflicts of interest outside the legal sphere, an appeal to the Arbitration Court, the decisions of which will be binding on both parties. The European States, called upon to play the role of arbitrator, must take upon themselves the obligation to achieve, by all means at their disposal, the implementation of the judgment rendered. Thus, the leading role of the leading powers will be once again confirmed.

V. The Jewish question.

An important component of the appeasement of Europe is the settlement of the Jewish question. By concluding a European convention, the necessary prescriptions for this part will be developed, and an organization will be created that will ensure the implementation of these prescriptions. The organization must exist at least until the issue is resolved by the total removal of the Jewish element from Europe.

VI. Economic organization of Europe.

(a) While in the political-military field and in matters of the preservation of peace the formation of assemblies of states on the model of the League of Nations should be avoided, in the economic field the system of conferences is expedient. At the same time, the European economy must be considered in the broadest terms, including here also labor and social issues. The Permanent European Economic Congress, directed and convened as necessary by its Presidium, consisting of representatives of the leading Powers and some other countries, should be divided into conferences according to:

- trade and industrial production,
- finance and currency,
- labor and social issues,
- problems of food, as well as agriculture and forestry.

A mandatory condition for participation in this organization for each state must be its membership in a European peace organization.

(6) Purpose of the Economic Congress and its conferences and their

committees is to prepare and implement European economic conventions that will regulate the economic problems of the Greater European-African zone in terms of its resistance in the event of a blockade, for example:

- 1) commodity exchange on the principle of preferential tariffs for European countries compared to non-European ones
- with the later goal of creating a European customs union;
- 2) European centralized clearing and firm intra-European monetary relations - with the later goal of creating a European monetary union;

- 3) equalization of working conditions and social security in the sense of raising their level;
- 4) long-term planning of production in the field of industry, as well as agriculture and forestry.

Within the framework of European economic conventions and related goals, each individual European country has the right to build its economic relations with other European countries as it sees fit. In developing its economic relations with non-European countries, each European state will also enjoy freedom - to the extent that it is not bound by European conventions, especially the principle of European preferences.

(c) Along with the European Economic Congress and its special conferences for certain fields of activity in certain countries and under their auspices, European special departments or institutions (European Labor Office, European Institute of Agriculture, etc.) will be created, which will be connected only general directives and tasks emanating from the Economic Congress or its conferences, and otherwise remain autonomous. Their task is to collect and test special materials, study new ideas, develop conclusions, give information, compile statistical data, etc. P.

UP. Transport organization.

The transport organization in the Greater European-African Area is being built on the same model. However, for this purpose, it is sufficient to create a permanent European Conference on Transport with committees for individual specialized branches (railroads, waterways, roads, organization of road

communications, canal construction, air transport, etc.). Here it is also expedient to create special departments and institutions for individual areas.

USh. Cultural cooperation.

For the development of culture, which proceeds mainly within the national framework, there is no need to create such a broad organization as is planned in the field of economy and transport. To manage the exchange of cultural values and experience, there are enough special departments and institutions. Perhaps, we can also discuss the issue of creating chambers (for example, the European Chamber of Cinema), which will directly unite the representations of individual countries by profession. Conferences with the participation of government representatives are needed only to the extent that it is necessary to develop special European conventions, for example in the field of copyright, the right of translation, etc. d.

TX. Press.

The great political significance of the press is associated primarily with the tasks of political organization. Ensuring the work of the press in the spirit of European solidarity and taking into account European obligations is in individual countries the task of the state leadership, arising from political agreements and the principles of the European Peace Pact. Possible differences of opinion regarding the position of the press in individual countries should be settled in accordance with the procedure provided for by the Peace Pact. However, it would be advisable to create, in addition, a special organization in the form of the European Press Institute, and possibly the European Press Chamber.

X. Education.

The education of young people in the new Europe will also be built mainly on a national basis. Therefore, it cannot be the subject of activity of a single European organization. The fact that it must be carried out in the spirit of European solidarity - just like the work of the press - makes it primarily a political issue to be considered in the light of the political treaties and the Peace Pact. But here too the creation

a European special institute for the exchange of experience, the collection of statistical data, etc. would be appropriate. In addition, a single organization of European youth must be created, which would serve in the first place the cause of

understanding among the peoples of Europe in the spirit of European solidarity.

Document 4. Note by Ambassador Cecil von Renthe-Fink, September 9, 1943

1. We are at the forefront of the great battle for the future of Europe, for the establishment of a new, better order, in which all European peoples will occupy their well-deserved and worthy place. So far we have avoided making concrete proposals on the European question. There is no doubt, however, that the question of Germany's plans for Europe deeply agitates the European peoples and decisively determines their positions. At the same time, the situation urgently requires the utmost effort of all the forces of Europe in order to achieve our victory. Hence the need to draw up a plan for a new organization of Europe, which would give the European peoples an incentive to contribute by their labor to our victory and would dispel their fears that after victory Germany would use her power, regardless of anyone.

2. If we now put forward the idea of creating a confederation of independent nations based on their voluntary cooperation, then this would certainly strengthen the confidence of the European peoples in our policy and increase their readiness to submit to our leadership and work for our victory. The very forces in Europe that fear Bolshevism but also fear Germany would no longer be tempted to look towards the Anglo-Saxons who had allied themselves with the Bolsheviks. A clear slogan for Europe (and the creation of a European Confederation of States is such) would make it possible to recruit more people in the conquered countries into the SS troops as an additional reserve for our struggle. We would create the basis for a constructive plan that would open up opportunities for positive and effective advocacy. We would increase the confusion of our opponents, since they are not able to oppose our plan with anything of equal value. We could successfully point out the complete uncertainty of the military goals of the opponents and their differences in this respect, since the claims of individual states hostile to us intersect and even are diametrically opposed. We could make greater use of the enemy's mistakes in dealing with small nations.

3. It must be assumed that the fact of the unification and appeasement of Europe

would have aroused in the Anglo-Saxon countries, primarily in the United States, the desire to end the war, since under these conditions it would have turned out to be meaningless. The morale of the British and Americans would be weakened if they had the impression that they were not liberating the European states, but were fighting against a united Europe. In domestic politics, this would have been a hard blow for Roosevelt, which could have affected his chances for re-election. Anti-German propaganda, both in the US and in England, would be deprived of its main arguments, and, on the contrary, opposition groups in both countries would be able to put forward convincing arguments, for example: what happened in America (unification of the states) cannot be prohibited in Europe. The unification of the European peoples would indeed be an event of the greatest political significance. It would also inevitably have a serious impact on the Soviet Union, which would see that it was opposed by the entire European continent as a whole.

4. France. The assessment of the consolidation of our continent abroad depends to a decisive extent on the attitude of France towards it, which exerts an extremely strong influence on the formation of world public opinion. Laval would doubtless have considered it advantageous to become an equal member of the European Confederation, and would have flattered himself with the hope that this would strengthen his internal political position in France, as well as improve the position of his country in relation to the victorious powers. He probably would not have dared to anger Germany by refusing. It will be necessary, however, to give Laval promises of a general character on the territorial question, for only under this condition will it be possible to count on the readiness of broad circles of the French people for cooperation; otherwise hard-to-reconcile contradictions

sooner or later they would flare up again and as a result the whole effect of the action would be in doubt. It goes without saying that an agreement with Laval, which, in connection with the entry of France into the European Confederation of States, could lead to the declaration of a de facto state of peace, will in no way restrict our rights as an occupying and belligerent Power. On the contrary, in the interests of the now common tasks and of her own future, increased obligations will be required from France, which the French government must solemnly assume. Among the efforts required of him would be the formation of more numerous contingents for the struggle for the freedom of Europe, which would contribute to the preservation of precious German blood.

5. Belgium, Holland, Norway. In view of the political importance attached in international politics to the problem of Belgium, Holland and Norway, the effect of the unification of the European peoples will be significantly weakened if the impression is formed abroad that these countries will not be admitted to the European confederation of states we have conceived as equal members. Since the beginning of the occupation, Belgium and Holland have not had their own governments. In order to join the European Confederation, they must have governments to act as contracting parties. In Belgium, for the sake of political effect, one should first of all try to negotiate with the king, since the government formed with his participation would give more weight in the opinion of foreign states to Belgium's entry into the European Confederation. In Holland the difficulty will be to form a government acceptable to us and able to win recognition also abroad.

There is a Quisling government in Norway, but its authority abroad is doubtful.

6. Southeast Europe. As for Greece and Serbia, the authority of their governments abroad is higher than that of the government of Norway. Their inclusion in the European Confederation, subject to the unanimity of the Axis Powers, is unlikely to cause serious difficulties.

7, East.

a) The paler the memory of Bolshevik domination in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania becomes, the stronger will be the impact of enemy propaganda claims that the German occupation has not changed much the situation of the peoples in the East. Only if certain assurances are given to these peoples for the future will they really recognize us as liberators from the Bolshevik yoke and will receive an incentive for voluntary active actions on our side. The Scandinavian countries, especially Finland, would enthusiastically welcome such a move. It would put England in an awkward position and further complicate the policy of the Soviet Union.

b) Despite the great importance that is attached abroad to the Polish problem, the inclusion of Poland in the confederation of [European] states as a member is not envisaged. If this topic becomes the subject of international discussion, it will be possible to say that the solution of the Polish question is postponed, because it depends on how the Polish people will manifest themselves during the war. One might consider creating

some puppet government in Poland. However, by doing so, we would probably limit our current freedom of action without achieving a corresponding political success.

c) For the occupied Russian regions, one can apparently find a similar formulation. It is clear that the hope of gaining a certain independence, having earned it by one's actions during the war, would greatly contribute to the pacification of the occupied regions and would actively stimulate the desire not only to work sparing no effort for the sake of our victory, but also to increase the number of those fighting on our side. From this point of view, one should also approach the Vlasov movement.

8. Neutral countries. As long as the war is going on, Sweden, Switzerland and Portugal cannot be expected to join the European Confederation of States. Their participation, however, does not

of decisive importance

because the appeasement of Europe does not depend on them, but on other states that have hitherto been at enmity with each other.

9. Does this turn towards the creation of a Confederation threaten our political goals in Europe? This question should be answered in the negative. We will not lose a shred of our power. It goes without saying that our rights as an occupying and belligerent power must not be restricted in any way. There is also no question of restoring the representations of the conquered countries abroad before the end of the war. On the contrary, one might think of giving them the right, if it is considered expedient, to establish their representations in Berlin.

As for the areas that it is desirable to annex to Germany, their admission to the European Confederation of States may be the first step towards the goal. In this way these areas will be drawn politically into our sphere of interest. If necessary, we can in advance, by agreement with them, secure for ourselves the rights to which we should certainly claim. When we have defeated the enemy on all fronts, a new situation will naturally arise that will immediately allow us to give our continent the shape that we see fit. The Greater German Reich would then become an immutable reality.

10. If it is decided to proceed with the organization of a European Confederation, the following thirteen States may first become members: Germany, Italy, France, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece,

Croatia. It will be possible to introduce the basic principles set out in Appendix 1 into the constituent documents.

First of all, an agreement should be reached with Italy, and the following points should be discussed with her approximately:

a) fundamental questions;

6) an acceptable period;

c) European states that must participate in the signing of the founding act (conditions for the involvement of France, Serbia and Greece);

d) European states to be invited later (neutral states, primarily Spain);

e) European states, the issue of future accession of which has not yet been resolved (Belgium, Holland, Eastern peoples);

f) the Polish problem;

g) attitude towards Turkey;

3) the content of constituent acts;

i) agreeing on the political line to be pursued in European matters after the signing of the founding act (drafting the documents of the confederation);

j) cooperation in the field of propaganda, and Japan should also be taken into account.

Then it would be necessary to negotiate first of all with Laval, as well as with the Finns and the states of South-Eastern Europe, in order to obtain a guarantee that there would be no

no difficulty.

The signing of the founding deed must take place in a safe place in Germany. If the presence of not only heads of government and foreign ministers, but also heads of state is required, then the Fuehrer will preside. The procedure may be the same as it was for the renewal of the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1941.

11. The establishment of a European confederation will be possible only after some significant military success, for example, after repulsing the Anglo-Saxon invasion of the continent. At the present stage of the war, some of our allies, primarily Finland, because of their relations with the United States, would probably not decide to join, although they would welcome the very idea of a federal structure.

So far, we can only talk about gradually propagating the idea of a confederation.

The appendix contains theses that could serve as guidelines for our propaganda.

If the Italians continue to fight on our side, it will be necessary to reach an agreement with them. [Promulgation] of the plan for the reorganization of Europe on a confederal basis would correspond to Italy's wish that we give reassuring assurances to the small nations. Our Axis partner would be freed from the fear that Germany is striving to establish its hegemony in Europe. Italian policy, which for some time has been following an independent path in European matters, would again be introduced in the same direction as our.

If the Italians withdraw from the war, it will be all the more important politically to define our own positions in European affairs. It can be assumed that in this case the Führer will make a statement about the military objectives of Germany in the current situation. This occasion can be used to assert that Germany desires the establishment of a New Order based on the federal principle.

Document 5. Draft Aide-mémoire of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of September 9, 1943

I. The need for the unification of Europe.

The unification of Europe, which has long been brewing in the course of history, is an inevitable process. The unheard of progress in technology, the reduction of distances thanks to modern means of communication, the monstrous increase in the range and destructive power of weapons (aviation), the heavy burden of weapons and the tendency of our time to establish long-distance economic ties and create large areas of joint production and management - all this forces Europe to close rallying. Europe has become too small for sovereign states that are at war with each other and fence themselves off from each other. In addition, a divided Europe is too weak to hold its positions in the world and ensure peaceful conditions for itself, while maintaining its originality and independence.

If Europe loses its position in the world, it will have an extremely heavy impact on all European peoples. None of the European peoples will be able to permanently protect themselves from the consequences of the decline of Europe. But for the rest of the world, the decline of Europe would be an irreparable loss.

The [process] of the unification of Europe is being accelerated by the war imposed on Germany by England, the longtime enemy of the continent. The struggle of Germany against England is a war for the unification of Europe.

P. The position of the Axis powers in Europe.

The element designed to promote the harmonization of the private interests of individual European states in the interests of Europe as a whole exists mainly in the person of the powers axes.

The opponents of the Axis powers are responsible for the collapse of the order they imposed on Europe after the First World War. They are incapable of offering the European peoples anything new and are completely at odds with each other as to what should happen in Europe if they win. Their plans intersect and contradict each other. Under pressure from the Soviet Union, which is plotting to reshape the European order according to its own directives under the Bolshevik leadership, England and the United States have already today retreated from the positions of the Atlantic Charter. The vague plans for the reorganization of the world put forward by the adversaries do not give any guarantee that the true needs and interests of the peoples, and not the selfish aspirations of the powers hostile to Europe, will prevail in the new organization they have conceived.

None of the enemy great powers that claim to decide the fate of Europe has roots in our continent and is not united with it by inseparable ties. The United States as a whole is tied with all its interests to the other part of the world. Nothing ties them to Europe. They will leave Europe to its own fate or hand it over to Bolshevism if they see fit. Bolshevism made European Russia alien to its European past. The cultural countries of Europe for the Soviet Union - from the worldview and military points of view - are just provinces to be conquered, alien bodies that must be removed in order to spread the Bolshevik regime throughout Europe. As for England, only part of her empire is in Europe. The center of gravity of her body is outside our continent. She created her world empire by exploiting the contradictions between the continental states, and in a consolidated Europe her political role would be more modest than before. Its policy is aimed at maintaining a state of disunity and hostility in Europe. Germany's efforts to create a solid foundation for the harmonious and friendly coexistence of the European continent and the British Empire by delimiting mutual interests, taking into account the vital needs of both countries, turned out to be futile because of the position of England, which did not want to renounce

its equilibrium policy serving its hegemonic tendencies. If England formerly subjected to hunger blockade the countries which, as her allies, shed blood for her sake, and tore from them their non-European possessions, today she bombards their cities and ruthlessly destroys their industries and their churches.

In contrast, the interests and needs of the Axis Powers are essentially and inextricably linked to those of Europe. The vital interests of Germany and Italy by no means go beyond the borders of Europe, nor are they limited to any of its separate, internally separated parts from the whole. Therefore, one should not fear that Germany might drag the European peoples into a policy contrary to their interests. The war now waged by the Axis Powers and their allies is also a struggle not only for their own existence, but for the secure and peaceful future of all European peoples.

Naturally, in Europe, the desire to create a New Order comes from the Axis powers.

III. The solution of the European question on a federal basis.

It would be wrong to underestimate the difficulties that stand in the way of resolving the European question. These difficulties are rooted not only in the difference in the views of the European peoples, but also in relations that are conditioned by the very essence of Europe and have been manifested again and again in one form or another over the centuries. You cannot ignore these relationships without losing solid ground under your feet. It is politically impossible to build the building of European unity on the basis of ideal requirements. The foundation for it can only be real political phenomena and historical development, which has led to a pronounced national identity of all European peoples.

The peculiarity of the European problem lies in the fact that in a relatively small space, in relations that combine elements of both unity and independence, it is forced coexistence of many completely different peoples. Combining them should be like this

strong, so that in the future there will never again be a war between them, and so that it will be possible to jointly protect the interests of Europe from the outside world. However, European states must at the same time preserve their freedom and independence in order to be able to solve their completely different national tasks and to fulfill their special functions within the whole with creative enthusiasm. The power and security of Europe do not rest on the forced, imposed subjugation of some European powers

others, but on their cohesion. Any attempt by one European power or another to compel others to some kind of political action will inevitably revive contradictions in Europe. On the other hand, a European power that does not show a readiness to harmonize its policy with the necessary requirements of European politics will place itself outside the framework of the European community.

The solution of the European question can be carried out only on a federal basis, on a free, caused by the understanding of the need for the decision of European states to unite in a community of sovereign states.

The creation of such a union of states should go through two stages. First of all, the relevant European governments must decide on the establishment of a confederation of states and draw up constituent acts in which it is necessary to indicate in general terms the purpose and fundamental principles of the confederation.

The second stage will be the detailed development of the structure of the confederation. For this purpose, immediately after the signing of the founding act, the plenipotentiaries of the signatories will meet for a meeting. Its results will be recorded in the documents of the confederation.

The decisive step will be the signing of the founding acts. By this action, the signatories will establish forever the principle of European solidarity and undertake to adhere to a single principled position in matters relating to the tasks of the European community.

THAT. Participation in the European Confederation of States.

The European confederation should be a community, if possible, of all European states. Individual European countries should not be allowed to be alienated from European cooperation.

To realize a European confederation, it is sufficient to unite the majority of European states; other European countries will have the opportunity to join it. The leading role of the European nations united in the European Confederation and the pressure of political and economic conditions Must inevitably lead to the fact that the rest of the states, sooner or later, will also join the European Confederation.

An attempt by the powers responsible for restoring order in Europe

after the end of the First World War, to perpetuate the distinction between winners and vanquished was not only a violation of solemnly given commitments, but also a grave political mistake. It has led to disastrous consequences for our continent. This mistake must not be allowed to repeat: in the new community of European peoples, the defeated states must assume an equal position from the very beginning if they are ready to contribute to the building of a new Europe by legitimate and positive efforts. All European nations that have stood the test of history, and especially of the present war, can become members of a European confederation of states.

If the European Powers, at the time of their entry into the European Confederation, have territorial possessions on other continents, these possessions are to be regarded as a private affair of those Powers, and the other European Powers will not assume the protection of these

possessions. The complications caused by a system of such possessions can affect the interests of Europe as a whole only if they lead to an attack by non-European powers on European territory. should be considered an area complementary to the European one.

D. Relations between the Member States of the European Confederation among themselves and with others continents.

1. It must be established in the first place that each of the Member States retains the freedom to determine its relations with other countries in or outside Europe as it sees fit, provided that these relations are compatible with European solidarity and European commitments. Only such treaties, which are contrary to the purpose of the confederation, should not be concluded; existing treaties of this kind should, of course, be terminated. Since it is assumed that the traditional cooperation of the Scandinavian states among themselves will not interfere with their loyal participation in solving the problems of the European community, then no obstacles are foreseen to the continuation of this cooperation. The same can be said about the preservation of relations between the states of the Iberian Peninsula among themselves, as well as with their kindred Latin American nations.

2. Each Member State of the European Confederation must

also have the right to arrange their national life at their own discretion, but subject to obligations towards the European community. In the relations of European states among themselves, therefore, the principle should be established that they will refrain from interfering in each other's internal affairs. The European states must be presented with a single requirement: to be loyal, committed to Europe members of the European Confederation and positively contribute to the solution of the problems of the European community. Each country must be responsible for ensuring that no action is taken on its territory that is incompatible with European solidarity and European commitments. The principle of mutual non-intervention must be supplemented by the principle of mutual favor. The greater favoring of European states towards each other in comparison with non-European countries will yield its results mainly in the field of

economy.

3. The relations of individual European states with non-European countries and continents must be regulated in accordance with the principle that our continent and any of its states cannot interfere in the affairs of other continents and carry out any seizures there by political or military means. This, however, equally precludes any intervention and any takeover by political or military means by [states] of other continents in Europe and in its complementary zone. Every such intervention and every such attack would be countered by the solidarity defense of Europe.

Otherwise, Europe's relations, including the region annexed to it by way of compensation, with other continents are governed by the general rules of interstate communication and are based on the fact that Europe, for its part, wishes to live with them in peace and friendship and maintain trade relations and cultural relations useful to all parties. exchange. Although the European living space must be shaped in such a way that Europe, having all the vital necessities, is able to withstand periods of political and military complications, the goal of economic interaction in Europe should not be to refuse the exchange of European countries with the world and from activities on the world stage. . On the contrary, Europe must become strong in order to play a leading role in world trade, which, in the present state of affairs, it risks losing.

VI. Tasks of the European Confederation of States.

1. Preservation of peace in Europe.

The task of the new European order must be to remove the circumstances that in the past gave rise to intra-European wars. The era of internal warfare in Europe must end, and European particularism must be overcome.

Individual members of the European federation, of course, are not forbidden to conclude agreements on arbitration and settlement of disputes among themselves. However, the guarantee of maintaining intra-European peace will not be a formal peace order or the threat of sanctions, but a European policy that prevents hostility between European states. If Europe has suffered from wars for centuries, then the policy of equilibrium, with the help of which England set one European state against another, is primarily to blame. A particularly important task of the nations united in a European confederation will be to resist in solidarity the attempts of non-European powers to influence intra-European affairs.

In Europe, it is impossible to radically solve national problems through territorial demarcation. The latter will not lead to even more serious tension only if all European states observe the principle of respect for the rights of other peoples and their fair treatment.

To ensure that the press acts in the spirit of European solidarity and respect for European obligations is the duty of the government leaders of individual countries, which arises from membership in the European Confederation. The same applies to the education of the rising youth, which must be carried out on a national basis, but in the spirit of European solidarity.

2. Ensuring common European interests in foreign affairs.

The aim of a confederation cannot be to interfere in the foreign policy of its members or to create a supranational European diplomacy. The task is first and foremost to ensure that in all matters relating to Europe as a whole, the European countries adhere to a single line of principle in relations with non-European states. This will be achieved through mutual information and consultation on current issues of political practice insofar as they concern common European interests.

3. Joint reflection of the Bolshevik threat.

Although the Comintern is officially dissolved, the Bolshevik threat to all

European peoples continues to exist, expressed both in ideological form and in the concentration of monstrous power, the dangerous dimensions of which have only now come to light. Without the elimination of the Bolshevik threat there can be no security and peace for Europe. The fact that in the East the formations and soldiers of almost all other European peoples fight side by side with German troops is a symbol of the community of danger and the community of the defensive spirit. One of the most important goals of a united Europe should be the protection of the European nations from the destructive forces of the East. Participation in the Anti-Comintern Pact and the implementation of the measures envisaged by it should be extended to all members of the European Confederation. But, moreover, in the interests of the whole of Europe, the European peoples, each within the limits of their capabilities, must contribute to the defense of their continent in the East. To this end, special agreements must be concluded, concerning primarily the formation of parts of volunteers.

4. Joint defense against attacks from outside.

It must be established in principle that an attack on Europe will be countered by the solidarity defense of the European peoples. In this regard, the military forces of the European peoples must be considered as parts of a single whole and their mutual correspondence must be ensured.

Today, only very large states are able to maintain the proper level of military power. The task of defense by one's own means has become insurmountable for small countries. Small countries do not have the necessary masses of people or the required industrial apparatus and are not able to provide food and raw materials. In this regard, nothing will change if they unite with each other. To successfully repel the attacks of non-European great powers, small European states need the support of Germany or Italy.

Geopolitical conditions suggest the need for regional division, which will by no means interfere with the solution of tasks that require common efforts. Vague general concepts, generally accepted in the past, cannot serve as a basis for effective defense and a fair distribution of military-political risk and military hardships. Therefore, regional defense agreements are needed on a voluntary basis between the states concerned in each case. These defensive agreements should organically intertwine and complement each other. It is natural that

they will be supported by the Axis Powers. If in the east and north-west of Europe Germany should become the main participant in the agreements, then in the Mediterranean Sea Italy should cooperate first of all. The scope of general tasks here is extremely wide. Suffice it to point out the importance of an agreement in principle on the standardization of armaments and equipment, the preparation of a centralized supply of individual countries in time of war, etc. Already in peacetime, European military units can be formed on the model of voluntary formations fighting in the East.

Those countries which, according to the agreement reached, will not take part in hostilities in repelling a possible attack on Europe must, nevertheless, render all possible support to the European states participating in defensive actions. European states embroiled in a war with non-European powers should not be treated as belligerents by other European states.

It should be considered that the unification of Europe into a defensive community will significantly reduce the likelihood of attacks on the continent. Non-European powers will beware of starting wars against European countries if they have to reckon with the fact that an entire part of the world, united together, will become their enemy.

5. Economic cooperation.

There can be no doubt that the dispersion of economic forces in Europe is the most serious obstacle to the well-being and social progress of its countries. True, the elimination of the danger of intra-European wars in itself should give a powerful impetus to economic development in Europe, but one should strive, through purposeful and planned cooperation between European states, to organize Europe in such a way that it achieves the highest and truly healthy economic prosperity.

Born out of necessity necessitated by the British blockade, the Greater Economic Zone must be expanded to meet Europe's vital needs of food, clothing and work. To this end, the productivity of the entire labor force and the use of all the resources of Europe, including its complementary area, should be maximized.

The backward economic regions in Europe must be developed through special, joint efforts. The standard of living of the broad masses in Europe, primarily in
regarding clothing, food and

housing, should be systematically increased, prudently take care of social security.

In accordance with tried and tested principles, through the planned cooperation of European states, European agriculture will be oriented to meet the needs of Europe and will be guaranteed the sale of its products at fair prices. Also, through planned cooperation, European industry, entrepreneurs and workers will be protected from the destructive effects of European and international crises, and the possibility of using an appropriate share of the world's raw materials will be ensured.

A properly organized Europe can be expected to again become the best buyer and the most reliable supplier on a global scale. Relying on the guaranteed opportunity to purchase raw materials outside its borders and process them at home, Europe, for its part, will offer non-European countries - suppliers of raw materials - guaranteed sales and stable prices.

The economic and social measure of value upon which joint economic forward planning will be built will be labor, not capital. This planning will be subject to the principle that the common space must adequately satisfy the vital needs of all its co-owners.

In order to revive mutual trade and create a large European market, customs and other barriers existing between individual states will be removed to an increasing extent, however, taking into account the need to preserve and protect vital sectors of the economy, especially small economic regions.

Experience has shown that the existing means of communication in Europe do not meet the increased requirements. The intra-European network of railways, roads, waterways and airlines will be expanded according to a single joint plan.

European states will render assistance and support to each other in solving problems arising during the period of transition from a war economy to a peaceful one.

6. Spiritual, cultural and professional exchange.

The unique spiritual richness possessed by Europe, which is insignificant in terms of territory, contrasting with the dull conformism of the Anglo-Saxon countries, is generated by the diversity of life forms and spiritual individualities of European peoples - small and large.

The European living space must provide all its co-owners who are loyal to Europe and intend to cooperate loyally and positively in solving the problems of the European community, the free development of their spiritual national identity. The deepening and development of spiritual and cultural exchange will open up new opportunities for the European peoples for the flourishing of their unique talents and forces. The intensification of this exchange, which should not lead to the unification of the European peoples and which should give equal chances to large and small peoples, will imbue them with a consciousness of common cultural foundations and become one of the strongest means of rallying the new community.

UP. Structure of the European Confederation.

The creation of a supranational European bureaucracy for the implementation of European cooperation would be inappropriate. The League of Nations conference system is also not an inspiring example. In order to achieve practical results in cooperation, it is necessary that the persons responsible in individual countries for the solution of certain problems, if possible, participate in the consideration of similar problems on a pan-European scale.

In the political field, the system of information and consultations through the usual diplomatic channels has justified itself. This system is effectively complemented by personal meetings of heads of state, heads of government and foreign ministers. If necessary, convene

ad hoc conferences. Such methods are more suited to practical needs in the political field than pre-scheduled periodic conferences.

One can imagine the following constitution of a confederation of states: the [supreme] body of the European confederation is the Congress of States, which is an assembly of representatives of the member states. It meets at least once a year. Unless the constitution of the confederation provides otherwise, the decisions of the Congress shall be taken unanimously. The Congress directs the affairs of the confederation, unless they are transferred to other bodies. Representatives of the member states of the confederation, accredited to the Axis Powers, form, together with the foreign ministers of Germany and, respectively, Italy, in Berlin and, respectively, in Rome, standing commissions, which, alternating annually, administer the affairs of the confederation between sessions of Congress.

It would be politically expedient for Member States

appointed their heads of government as permanent representatives to Congress, and their foreign ministers as their permanent deputies.

In contrast, economic, cultural and professional cooperation requires special permanent bodies. To deal with economic issues, a permanent European Economic Council should be created, consisting of [representatives of] all member states. This council can presumably be subdivided into the following commissions:

- trade, industrial production and shipping;
- finance and currency;
- on labor and social issues;
- food, agriculture and forestry.

The task of the European Economic Council and its commissions is to prepare and conclude European economic agreements in order to solve common economic problems. Such tasks may be, for example, the settlement of economic problems associated with the ongoing blockade; regulation of trade on the basis of preferences for European countries in comparison with non-European countries with the aim of creating in the future a European customs union and a free European market; [organization] of central European clearing and [ensuring] stable intra-European monetary relations with a view to creating a European monetary union in the future; convergence of working conditions and social security in Europe towards improvement; long-term planning of production both in the field of industry and agriculture and forestry.

In addition to the European Economic Council and its special conferences, European special administrations are established for the respective areas (European Labor Office, European Institute of Agriculture, etc.), which are guided only by the general directives and tasks of the European Economic Council or its conferences, and in the rest are autonomous bodies. Their task is to collect and process special data, evaluate new ideas, give feedback, issue certificates, compile

statistical reports, etc.

A similar structure will have an organization dealing with the issues of communications of the Greater European Area. For this purpose, however, it is sufficient to create a permanent European Transport Council with commissions for certain special sectors (iron

roads, waterways, highways, road traffic, canal construction, air traffic, etc.). And in this case, it is appropriate to establish special departments for individual industries.

Cultural cooperation does not require the creation of such an extensive organization as the economy and transport. For the exchange of cultural values and experience, it is enough to create special departments and institutions. It is also possible to create chambers, such as the European Chamber of Cinematography, the European Chamber of Press, staffed by specialists representing individual countries. Conferences of government representatives will only be needed to develop special conventions, for example in the field of copyright, the right of translation, etc. All of the above should be created on the basis of already existing or emerging European organizations or in cooperation with them.

It is impossible to base the relations of individual European states among themselves and each with all the rest on some abstract formula. It is equally difficult to divide the European peoples into great powers, medium states, and small states. All of them are concrete historical figures, which should be judged by their historical achievements, their cooperation in the reconstruction of Europe, and especially by their merits in the present war.

However, the European Confederation will not be able to carry out fruitful cooperation if it does not have leadership aimed at promoting a greater coherence of the national interests of the member states of the community. In this regard, leadership means establishing relationships of mutual loyalty and trust, abandoning the dictatorial methods of the past, and the responsibility of the strongest powers that falls to their lot as a result of their authority in European and international affairs. If the leading role is the privilege of the strongest powers, then it also means for them the obligation to act only in the interests of European peace, progress and prosperity and to limit themselves only to what is absolutely necessary for European coexistence. The leadership of the Axis Powers in Europe is a fact that follows naturally from political conditions. In order for it to be carried out, no special fixing in the constitution of the confederation is required. The question of whether and in what form this fact will be officially recorded in the constitution must be decided from the point of view of expediency.

VIII. Enemy propaganda.

Opponents tried to discredit the New Order in Europe proposed by the Axis Powers by presenting as the New Order the measures to which Germany was forced by military conditions. They portrayed the matter as if the inevitable consequences of war and occupation, especially in the face of unreliability of the population and authorities, would be the normal state when Germany and her allies were victorious. They are silent about the fact that they themselves doom the population of Europe to starvation by means of a blockade, bring unspeakable disasters to Europe with their air raids and, with their alliance with Bolshevism, open access to Europe to the destructive forces of the East, while Germany is making every effort to protect and provide for the European population. . The Axis Powers, themselves an integral part of Europe, have only one goal: to win friends and collaborators in the peoples of Europe for the reconstruction of Europe and to extend a hand of reconciliation even to the hostile peoples of Europe. However, while the war lasts and enemy propaganda tries to stir up the population of the occupied areas, bringing trouble to them, the position of the Axis powers is determined by the severe necessity caused by the war imposed on Germany.

Document 6. Draft Regulations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the "European Confederation" of September 9, 1943

(a) The European Confederation is a community of sovereign states mutually guaranteeing their freedom and independence.

(6) Individual states retain the sovereign right to determine their internal order.

(c) The nations united in a confederation will jointly defend the interests of Europe in the field of international relations. They will jointly oppose influences alien to Europe and jointly wage the struggle against Bolshevism. In order to defend Europe against attacks from without, defensive agreements must be concluded.

(d) The European economy will be built by the members of the confederation on the basis of their common and national interests according to a single plan. The purpose of cooperation should be to increase material well-being and strengthen social justice and social security in individual states, to protect the European economy from crises and economic threats from outside by developing resources and

exploiting the labor reserves of Europe and its complementary African region, as well as ensuring that the European peoples have access to an appropriate share of the economic benefits of the world.

(e) Customs and other barriers between the individual members of the confederation, which impede the revival of European trade, must be steadily removed, provided that vital branches of the economy, especially small economic regions, are preserved and protected.

The intra-European network of railways, waterways and airlines will be expanded according to a single plan.

(f) In solving the economic problems of the period of transition from a military economy to a peaceful economy, the members of the confederation will provide assistance and support to each other.

(g) The states united in the European Confederation will, preserving their national identity, expand and deepen cultural and spiritual exchange.

(3) European states not included in the confederation at the time of its establishment will be invited to join the "European Confederation".

(i) The structure of the "European Confederation" will be fixed in full detail in the constitution of the confederation, which will be discussed by representatives of the governments of all participating states.

Document 7. Directions of the Committee for European Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of September 9, 1943

1. The unification of Europe, already ripening in the course of history, is an inevitable process.

Its necessity is caused by the unprecedented progress of technology, the reduction of distances due to modern means of communication, the monstrous increase in the range and destructive power of weapons (aviation), the heavy burden of weapons and the tendency of our time to establish long-distance economic ties and create large areas of joint production and management (the era of great empires and associations on a continental scale).

Without unification, Europe will not be able to hold its place in the world, which will affect the interests of all European peoples (common destiny).

P. As a result of the war imposed on Germany by England, an old enemy

continent, the unification of Europe has become an acute problem, and its process has accelerated. The struggle of Germany against England is a war for the unification of Europe.

Fri. Germany is striving for the unification of Europe on a federal basis, that is, for the voluntary rallying of all the European peoples that have stood the test of history into a community of sovereign states, generated by the consciousness of the need.

GU. The member states of the European Confederation retain their independence and freedom. Intervention in the internal affairs of states is not envisaged.

W. European states have only one requirement: to be loyal, committed to Europe members of the European community and contribute positively to the solution of the problems of the community.

VI. The central position of the Axis Powers in Europe and their political influence place a special responsibility on them in intra-European and international affairs. It is in this sense that the leading role of the Axis powers should be understood. It does not mean domination, but a relationship of mutual devotion and trust with a rejection of the methods of imperial dictate of a bygone era.

UP. The aim of European cooperation is to promote the peace, security and well-being of all European states and their peoples.

USh. The task of the New European Order will be to radically eliminate the circumstances that have served in the past as the causes of wars in Europe, to end the era of wars between European states and European particularism.

IX. A common obligation for all European peoples will be the defense and defense of Europe from attacks from without. The brunt of this obligation will be borne by the Axis Powers.

X. The task of European cooperation will be to protect Europe from influences alien to it, in order to make it impossible in the future to set one European people against another. The policy of equilibrium will be replaced by the policy of European solidarity.

XI. The European peoples united in a confederation form a common front against Bolshevism.

HP. Joint efforts will be made to provide Europe with all the vital necessities and protect it from the threat of economic war and starvation blockade.

xsh. Through systematic work in the field of the economy, the maximum productivity of the entire labor force will be achieved, the exhaustive use of all the resources of Europe and the African region that complements it in order to increase material well-being and strengthen social justice and social security in individual states.

By common efforts the backward economic regions will be developed, and as a result the standard of living of the broad masses will be raised. In particular, measures will be taken to market European agricultural products at fair prices.

KSU. In order to revive the mutual exchange of goods, customs and other barriers that exist between individual European states will have to be steadily removed, but at the same time, special attention will be paid to the preservation and protection of vital sectors of the economy, especially in small economic regions.

XU. The intra-European network of railways, roads, waterways and airlines will be expanded according to the general plan.

XII. During the period of transition from a war economy to a peaceful economy, the members of the confederation will provide each other with assistance and support in solving related problems.

HUP. Spiritual and cultural exchange will deepen and develop while maintaining national identity.

In order to give a visible expression to the common destinies of the European peoples and to ensure that there will never again be wars between the European peoples, the heads of state, as well as the heads of governments, gathered and decided to establish a European confederation for all time.

The following principles will be fundamental for the confederation.

1. The European Confederation is a community of sovereign states mutually guaranteeing their freedom and independence.

2. Individual states retain the sovereign right to determine their internal state system.

3. The nations united in a Confederation will jointly defend the interests of Europe in the field of international relations. They will jointly oppose alien Europe influences and

fight together against Bolshevism.

For the purpose of defending Europe against attacks from without, defensive agreements.

4. The European economy will be built by the members of the Confederation on the basis of their common and national interests according to a single plan. Its purpose should be to increase material well-being and strengthen social justice and social security in individual states, to protect the European economy from crises and economic threats from outside by developing the resources and use of the labor reserves of Europe and the African region that complements it, and also to achieve for European peoples access to an appropriate share of the economic benefits of the world.

5. Customs and other barriers between individual members of the Confederation, which impede the revival of intra-European exchange, will have to be steadily removed while preserving and protecting vital branches of the economy, especially small economic regions.

The intra-European network of railways, waterways and airlines will be expanded according to a single plan.

6. In solving the economic problems of the period of transition from a military economy to a peaceful economy, the members of the Confederation will provide each other with assistance and support.

7. The states united in the European Confederation will, preserving their national identity, expand and deepen cultural and spiritual exchange.

8. European states not included in the Confederation at the time of its establishment will be invited to join the "European Confederation".

9. The structure of the "European Confederation" will be fixed in all details in the constitution of the Confederation, for the discussion of which the representatives of the governments of all participating states will gather.

List of used literature

1. Collections of documents

11 Hass C, Schumann W. (Hg). Anatomie der Aggression: neue Dokumente zu den Kriegszielen des fascistischen deutschen Imperialismus im zweiten Weltkrieg. Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1972. 238 S.

1.2 Lipgens W. (Hg). Documents on the History of European Integration. Vol. 1: Continental Plans for the European Union 1939-1945. European University Institute, Series B: History. Instituto Universitario Europeo (Florence); Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985. 823 S.

1.3 Neulen HW (Hg). Europa und das 3. Reich. Einigungsbestrebungen im deutschen Machtbereich 1939-45. Munich, 1987. 466 S.

2. Publications of the period of the National Socialist dictatorship and occupation

2.1 Goebbels J. Der steile Aufstieg. 1944, \$159.

2.2 Goebbels J. Rede - Wollt Ihr den totalen Krieg. 1943, 15 S.

2.3 Nationalpolitische Aufklärungsschriften. Heft 18 - Brüder vor den Toren des Reiches, 1942. 32 S.

2.4 Quisling V. Russland und wir. 1942, 97 S.

2.5 Rosenberg A. Blut und Ehre. Ein Kampf für deutsche Wiedergeburt, 1938. 398 S.

3. Documents from the archive of Professor Gerd Simon

3.1 Amt Schrifttumspflege: Europas Schicksalskampf (1938)

3.2 Auswärtiges Amt: Europäischer Staatenbund (1943)

3.3 Baumann A. Ein Sprachamt in Europa (1933)

3.4 Bremer O. Über eine friedliche Germanisierung der Ostmark (1904)

3.5 Classen W. Geistige Kriegsführung der Westmächte (1943)

3.6 Daitz W. Europa Charta (1943)

3.7 Pai? W. Nordische und mittelmeerländische Geisteshaltung - die Fundamente Europas (1937)

3.8 Daitz W. Zum Einstampfen der Europa Charta (1944)

3.9 Dolezalek A. Was ist europäisch? (1945)

3.10 Erler GHJ Das Recht der nationalen Minderheiten (1931)

3.11 Evola J. Abendländischer Aufbau aus urarischem Geist (1937)

3.12 Levin R. Plan eines deutsch-europäischen Kultursenders (1941)

3.13 Loesch K. Ch., von. Die Volker Europas (1943)

Lutz G. Eine Leistungsschau deutscher Geisteswissenschaften (1942)

3.15 Patitsas Ph. Die Bedeutung des Europa-Gedankens für Griechenland (1942)

3.16 Plassmann JO Festigung des deutschen Volkstums (8.12.1939)

3.17 Reichssicherheitshauptamt: Esperanto (1940)

3.18 Rosenberg A. Erhaltung der Kampfmoral der europäischen Legionen (1944)

3.19 Rosenberg A. Europa, der Norden und Deutschland (1934)

Schmidt-Rohr G. Mutter Sprache (1933)

Schmidt-Rohr G. Unsere Muttersprache als Waffe und Werkzeug des deutschen Gedankens (1917)

3.22 Schmidt-Rohr G. Volkstumspolitische Aufgaben im Bereich der vorbedenkenden militärischen Planung

3.23 Schmidt-Rohr G. Von der Notwendigkeit eines Geheimen politischen Sprachamtes (1940)

3.24 Schmidt-Rohr C. Vorschläge zur Pflege und Nutzung geistig- seelischer Kraftmöglichkeiten für die Machtpolitik

3.25 Six F.A. Europa-Begriff (1941)

3.26 Six FA Europa-Tradition und Zukunft (1944)

3.27 Studentischer Kulturaustausch: Europa-Studienkreise (1942)

3.28 VladescuTh. Europa, ein totalitärer Staat (1942)

3.29 Ziegler W. Der Ordnungsgedanke in der europäischen Geschichte (1942)

4. Research literature

4.1 Au G., Nesch 5. Vordenker der Vernichtung: Auschwitz und die deutschen Pläne für eine neue europäische Ordnung. Fischer Taschenbücher Allgemeine Reihe, Geschichte // Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. 2013. 525 S.

4.2 Conze V. Das Europa der Deutschen: Ideen von Europa in Deutschland zwischen Reichstradition und Westorientierung (1920-1970). Studien zur Zeitgeschichte. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2005. 453 S.

4.3 Elvert J. Mitteleuropa: deutsche Pläne zur europäischen Neuordnung (1918-1945). Historische Mitteilungen. Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. 448 S.

4.4 Gruchmann L. Nationalsozialistische Großraumordnung. Die Konstruktion einer "deutschen Monroe Doktrin". Stuttgart: Deutsche Verl. Anst. 166S.

45 Grunert B. Der Europagedanke westeuropäischer fascistischer Bewegungen 1940-1945. Schöningh, 2012. 318 S.

4.6 Hecker-Stampehl 7. Vereinigte Staaten des Nordens: Integrationsideen in Nordeuropa im Zweiten Weltkrieg, Studien zur Internationalen Geschichte. Oldenbourg Verlag, 2011. 471 S.

4.7 Kahrs H. Modelle für ein deutsches Europa: Ökonomie und Herrschaft im Grosswirtschaftsraum. Beiträge zur nationalsozialistischen Gesundheits- und Sozialpolitik. Rotbuch, 1992. 239 S.

4.8 Kaiser B. Eurofaschismus und bürgerliche Dekadenz: Europakonzeption und Gesellschaftskritik bei Pierre Drieu la Rochelle. Kieler ideengeschichtliche Studien: Regio-Verlag, 2011. 158 S.

4.9 Kletzin B. Europa aus Rasse und Raum: die nationalsozialistische Idee der Neuen Ordnung. LIT Verlag Münster, 2000. 242 S.

4.10 Laughland J. The Tainted Source: The Undemocratic Origins of the European Idea. Undemocratic Origins of the European Idea. Warner Books, 1998. 402 S.

4.11 Loth W. Der Weg nach Europa: Geschichte der europäischen Integration 1939-1957. Kleine Vandenhoeck-Reihe, Orbis Biblicus Et Orientalis, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990. 180 S.

4.12 Majer D., Hoehne W. Europäische Einigungsbestrebungen vom Mittelalter bis zur Gründung der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft (EWG). 1957. Juris Fontes: Rechtsquellen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart / Hrsg. von D. Majer, W. Hoehne, W.-D. Barz. KIT Scientific Publishing, 2014. 256 S.

4.13 Mazower M. Hitlers Imperium: Europa unter der Herrschaft des Nationalsozialismus. CH Beck, 2009. 664 S.

4.14 Niess F. Die europäische Idee - aus dem Geist des Widerstands Beiträge Zur Kolonial- Und Überseegeschichte. Edition Suhrkamp; Suhrkamp, 2001. 246 S.

4.15 Opitz R. Europastrategien des deutschen Kapitals: 1900-1945. Pahl-Rugenstein, 1994. 1069 S.

4.16 Overy RJ, Houwinkten C. Die "Neuordnung" Europas: NS-Wirtschaftspolitik in den besetzten Gebieten. Nationalsozialistische Besatzungspolitik in Europa 1939-1945: Essay Philosophie. RJ Overy: Metropol, 1997. 300 S.

4.17 Tauber J. Collaboration in Nordosteuropa. Veröffentlichungen des Nordost-Instituts, Nordost Institut. Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 2006. 478 S.

4.18 Taylor PA, Niedzwiecki A., Rath M., Kowalczyk A. Die Nazis-Wurzeln de "Brüssler EU". Dr. Rath Education Services BV, 2011. 292 S.

5. Articles 5.1 Karl Richard Ganzer: Das Reich als Europäische Ordnungsmacht. //

Europäische Geschichte. Quellen und Materialien (Hagen Schulze, Ulrike Paul - Hrsg.). München: Bayerischer Schulbuch Verlag, 1994. S. 383-385.

5.2 Kluke P. Nationalsozialistische Europa-Ideologie // VfZ. 1955. Nr. 3. S. 240-275.

5.3 Salewski M. Europa. Idee und Wirklichkeit in der nationalsozialistischen Weltanschauung und Praxis // Europas Mitte (Otmar Franz Hg). Musterschmidt and Göttingen 1987, pp. 85-106.

5.4 Krüger P. Hitlers Europapolitik // Der Nationalsozialismus. Studien zur Ideologie und Herrschaft (Wolfgang Benz u.a. Hg). Frankfurt, 1993. S. 104-132.

Alexander Dolezalek's department at work

Das deutsche Friedensziel : i idg enossenschaft

— 3rd | oe... - - - - - — — — o—®— — NT TE re and = — — — m -- +

Map prepared by Alexander Dolezalek's department

Germany is the defender of Europe"

Propaganda poster "

A 1 IME A LEGION E a | UT HEIL HITLER de unten AR |<

French volunteers are heading to Vostochny T The idea of fighting Bolshevism still excites them

Foreign Minister of the Third Reich Joachim von Ribbentrop

A > bg _ +

German diplomat Cecile von Renthe-Fink

Aristide Briand (center) is considered the formal parent of the ideas of a "united Europe"

Mussolini for the "consolidation of Europe" created special

"Committee for the Universalization of Rome's Experience"

Finnish President Risto Heikki Ryti considered the possibility of unification as a possibility of annexing Soviet territories.

a IE 214 Otto Abetz (left) at a diplomatic reception in Paris

KATYA ARRENA ima er

Sat ah)

DUARMSCHILDE mit des ränincher Sansita und a RRAGENSPIEGEL as ao politischen | U)

depicted "pan-European state of the SS"

AVEC

cloudy. V H IN! Propaganda poster extolling the imaginary unification of Europe through parts of the Waffen-SS

is

Léon Degrelle speaking at a Belgian Rexist rally

~-TA/

Léon Degrelle (left) in a Zszs uniform

Heinrich Himmler, Anton Mussert and Arthur Seyss-Inquart (from right to left)

Vidkun Quisling

Oswald Mosley speaking at a rally

Marshal Pétain

-e

e la*

dg-i; 0DR

Congress of the Party of the French People. From the high rostrum sounds a call for a "campaign to the East"

y a y š . 9 2 F with v 5 5, at Bie 7 with vv „un

Mass event under the slogan "Europe will win!"

a T)

Ea

LEGION oes VOLONTAIRES FRANCAIS sontwe te BOLCHEVISME

Propaganda posters urging Europeans to start a "crusade against the USSR"

z 3 2 2 \$ i

w r a w Q = <: az

ENGAGEZ VOUS

NIAL

CONTR LE BOLCHEVISME

a FELLES FRONT ILO BOLSIEVISMEN

Notes

In Russian literature, he is often mistakenly called Henri Le Mans.

This is how the title of the work should be translated, which traditionally sounds like "The Decline of Europe" in Russia.

It refers to the "national revolution", that is, the coming of the National Socialists to power in 1933.